DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 600 VT 005 638

By-Main, Earl D.

A Nationwide Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Job Training Programs. Report No. 118.

Chicago Univ., Ill. National Opinion Research Center.

Spons Agency-Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research (DOL), Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Oct 66

Contract-Contract-81-15-66-13

Note-176p.

Available from-Library, National Opinion Research Center, 6030 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637 ($6.25).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.90

Descriptors-*Adult Vocational Education, Comparative Analysis, Control Groups, Employer Attitudes, *Employment Experience, Employment Patterns, Employment Programs, Federal Programs, Followup Studies, *Income, National Surveys, Participant Characteristics, Program Attitudes, *Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, Underemployed, Unemployed

Identifiers-Manpower Development and Training Act Programs, MDTA

To learn what effects Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) institutional job training courses had on income and employment, a nationwide representative sample of about 1,200 former trainees (784 completers and 413 dropouts) were interviewed early in 1966--over a year after their job training--to learn their opinions of the programs and their subsequent employment experiences. A partially matched control group of 925 persons who were unemployed at the time trainees entered training was also interviewed, as well as 136 persons who had been referred to the courses but who failed to enroll and participate. The effects of training were ascertained through comparison of the sample groups, using multiple regression analysis to control for the effects of 10 factors other than training. A large number of tentative findings were reached, the most general and conclusive of which were: (1) Most trainees gave favorable evaluations of their training, (2) Training apparently did not help get better paying jobs, but it did help former trainees to obtain more full-time employment, and (3) It was estimated that between 13 and 23 percent of the full-time employment experienced during the period after training was attributable to Manpower Development and Training Act for completers, and between 7 and 19 percent for dropouts. (ET)

Report No. 118

a nationwide evaluation of M.D.T.A. institutional job training programs

by

Earl D. Main

National Opinion Research Center/UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

OCTOBER, 1966

ED025600

VT005638

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED025600

1 A NATIONWIDE EVALUATION OF M.D.T.A. INSTITUTIONAL JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

by

2 Earl D. Main

This research was supported by the
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
of the U.S. Department of Labor under Contract 81-15-66-13

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago
6030 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Report No. 118 October, 1966

(This version supercedes that dated September, 1966)

norc

national opinion research center

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
6030 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
684-5600 Area Code 312
NORMAN M. BRADBURN, Director
PAUL B. SHEATSLEY, Survey Research Service Director

Letter of Transmittal

October, 1966

The Office of Manpower Policy
Evaluation and Research
U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

We are pleased to enclose herewith our report, "A Nationwide Evaluation of Manpower Development and Training Act, Institutional Job Training Programs" by Earl D. Main.

Any opportunity to evaluate a social action program of this magnitude is a serious challenge. In this case, the institutional job training programs were designed to locate unemployed and under-employed men and women, give them new skills, and thereby enable them to re-enter the job market, to take and hold more stable and satisfying jobs and, to the extent possible, increase their incomes. Is the program successful? How shall we find out? More important, how shall we find out quickly enough so that the results can be used to improve the program?

In a perfect world, one would select otherwise identical unemployed (and under-employed) persons and enter one of them in the re-training program while the other was not being re-trained. Of course, this would be in fact impossible. What we have done instead is select a sample of persons who entered the re-training program, and then attempted to locate a very similar group of people from the same communities who were also unemployed at that period of time, and contrast the two groups. There are many problems with this analysis. The manpower training programs vary considerably from one community to another, and by putting all training programs alumni together, we are no doubt, concealing the very different types of effects which different types of programs have. Furthermore, we are the victims of any secular trends in the economy--in this case we find that employment rates are high for both the alumni of the training programs and "control group" simply because the economy was running in high gear at the time of our interviewing. Most important, we need to know whether the differences between the training program alumni and the control group are really attributable to the program or whether they are the result of some other difference between the two groups. This last problem is an extremely difficult one to solve.

The technique we have used here is multiple regression. A more detailed discussion of the technique is given in the body of the report, but in a sentence, it is a statistical technique designed to look simultaneously at many of the factors which affect a person's ability to hold a job or earn a high income and answer statistically the question whether the training program has an effect independent of all these other factors.

In the best tradition of evaluation research, our report is as conservative as it is possible to make it. Just as there are many unknown ways to overstate an effect of a program there are also many ways in which that effect may be concealed or understated. In general, where we find an ambiguous result, we have chosen to interpret it as not indicating conclusive evidence that the re-training programs are successful.

The main analysis of this report is in Chapters III and IV. In Chapter III, we attempt to answer the question, "What is the impact of the training program upon employed alumni in terms of income?" Here we find no conclusive evidence that the alumni of the training programs who are working have higher paying jobs than those persons who obtained a job without going through the program. There are, however, two facts which other analysts might have interpreted as more conclusive evidence. First, despite the fact that the control group and the alumni of the program were selected to be as similar as possible, we find that the trainees actually had slightly lower weekly incomes before they were trained than the control group did. After training this difference disappeared. At first glance this may seem to be very favorable evidence that the program was able to raise the incomes of low-income persons. However, there are certain ambiguities here. For example, it is possible that persons who were temporarily making very low incomes were more predisposed to enter the training program than were others. Given this and other possible interpretations, we have chosen to interpret this finding as inconclusive evidence that the training program had a positive effect on wages.

Similarly, if one examines the effect of the program upon the incomes of persons whose previous income was very high or very low, we find a clear tendency for those trainees with very low previous incomes to have significant increases, while those persons whose earlier income was quite high were very likely to take a job paying less after finishing the program. It may be that this indicates the ability of the training program to locate workers in very poorly paying jobs and re-train them for jobs with much more adequate salaries. On the other hand, the finding is ambiguous because we do not know how much mere random fluctuation in jobs would enable persons with very low salaries at one time to be earning higher salaries at another without the intervention of any governmental action. Thus, we have chosen not to interpret this as conclusive evidence either.

But no matter how conservative we attempt to be, the final conclusion of Chapter III seems irrefutable--while employed alumni of the training program may or may not be making more money in terms of weekly wages, total family income is considerably higher for trainees than for non-trainees. This suggests quite strongly that alumni of the program have more stable employment. And Chapter IV indicates that this is indeed the case. In that chapter we see that even when strict controls in regression equations are introduced for such factors as their education, race, previous unemployment, geographic region, and marital status, there is a decisive tendency for alumni of the programs to be employed a considerably greater proportion of the time after training. For the average training graduate, the net effect of the program is estimated at seven to twelve weeks additional full-time employment in a year.

The personal evaluations of job training courses by former trainees included both positive and negative reactions, but the majority were definitely favorable--even among "dropouts," and especially among those who completed training. These subjective evaluations, therefore, are in basic agreement with the main objective conclusion that M.D.T.A. job training apparently does increase employment for trainees.

Evaluation research is always challenging, and the results are always open to debate. It may be that some peculiar and rare difference between our trainees and the matched control group is the real base of the difference between them, although we cannot imagine what such a factor may be. It is, therefore, technically possible for this report to make a favorable evaluation of the training programs which would not be justified by the results of an even more exhaustive analysis. We frankly think this is unlikely. There is a greater chance that our findings are too conservative, that, for example, there is a real and significant impact upon the wages earned by manpower trainees which we have not isolated. We are a long way away from perfection in evaluation research techniques; indeed, perfection is unattainable. This report does, however, present an evaluation of the M.D.T.A. programs using the best techniques available in contemporary social science.

Sincerely yours,

Norman M. Bradburn
Director

NMB:rlt

PREFACE

In order to assure that funds and human effort are used effectively, any program as large and important as the institutional job training courses conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act should be carefully evaluated. Such evaluation should not be limited to opinions about or reactions to the training courses, but should use objective data to determine the effects of the program on the economic situations of trainees--not only just after they leave their courses, but at least several months later. This type of evaluation has been conducted before in certain areas of the United States, but no nationwide evaluation has been done in the past. For that reason, the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research asked the National Opinion Research Center to conduct research on a national scale, with primary emphasis on a comparison of MDTA trainees with non-trainees who had been unemployed about the time the trainees started their courses.

Because a nationwide evaluation was desired as soon as possible, this study could not use the time-consuming approach of interviewing trainees and a control group of non-trainees both before and after training. Instead, interviews were to be conducted with trainees who had been out of training for at least a year, asking retrospective questions to obtain information for the periods before, during, and after training. Such an ex post facto research design has its limitations, of course. The memories of respondents are not likely to be as accurate as desired in some respects. Instead of a true control group which differs from the trainees only in not having taken the training, it is necessary to use a group which is only roughly matched to the trainees on certain characteristics.

Given these limitations of the research, this report cannot be regarded as the last word on the subject. If such a research project should appear to demonstrate that MDTA training did improve the economic situations of trainees, then additional research to more carefully determine the value of the program would be warranted. If, on the other hand, the findings should fail to demonstrate any concrete benefits from MDTA training, this would suggest that changes aimed at improving the program should be made rather than conducting long-term research on the existing program.

The author did not become involved in this research project until almost one-half of the interviews had already been completed; therefore much of the work obviously was done by other persons. The principal investigator was Joe L. Spaeth, who was primarily responsible for the research design and who continued to provide important guidance throughout the project. Beatrice Treiman also participated in the design stage. Seymour Sudman was responsible for the sample design, and was a methodological consultant. Harold Levy helped to construct the questionnaire and was involved in the early stages of data processing. Eve Weinberg also helped in questionnaire construction and field work consultation. Marilyn Haskell supervised the field work, and Frances Harris supervised the coding. Winona Atkins was primarily responsible for data cleaning, and also did some coding and data processing. James Jasper wrote needed computer programs, and he and Richard Bennett did most of the data processing. The analysis could not have been completed in so short a time without the advice and assistance of Frank Bamberger, William Mason, and

Paul Siegel in relation to multiple regression analyses. And the report would have taken much longer to prepare without the extra effort put forth by research assistant Ruth Moser, editors Timothy Enos and Bonnie McKeon, and typists Toshi Takahashi and Rose Thomas. To these and others who performed vital services--often in the hours between midnight and dawn--credit and thanks are gratefully given. Thanks are also due to OMPER for financing the study, and to Vaughn Davison and other OMPER staff for their help and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

I. THE RESEARCH DESIGN 1

- Purpose 1
- Method 3

II. COMPARISONS OF RESPONDENT TYPES 10

- Background Characteristics 11
- Employment and Income History 17
- What They Said about Training and Jobs 22

III. TRAINING AND INCOME 47

- Weekly Wages 47
- Family Income 54

IV. TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT 59

- Effects of Training and Background 60
- Controlling Additional Variables 67
- Effects of Course Completion 75
- Length and Type of Training 78

V. SUMMARY 88

- Method 89
- Comparisons Before Training 90
- Opinions of Training and Jobs 92
- Training and Income 95
- Training and Employment 98
- Conclusion 101

APPENDIX

A. Sample Design 104

B. Estimates of Sampling Error 108

C. Multiple Regression Results 113

D. Employers' Evaluations of Trainees 117

E. The Questionnaires 122

- MDTA Employer's Questionnaire
- Main Sample
- Control Group

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

II.1 Age, by Respondent Type 14

II.2 Education, by Respondent Type 15

II.3 Unemployment in the Year Before Training, by Respondent Type 19

II.4 Last Full-time Wages Before Training, by Respondent Type . 20

II.5 Family Income Before Training, by Respondent Type 22

II.6 Most Important Reason for Wanting Training, by Respondent Type 25

II.7 How Well Training Was Liked, by Sex and Respondent Type . . 31

II.8 Selected Skills Learned in Training, by Sex and Respondent Type 33

II.9 How Well Qualified in Training Occupation, by Sex and Respondent Type 36

II.10 Amount of Confidence in Ability To Learn and Hold a New Job Before Training and Now, by Respondent Type 38

II.11 Full-time Jobs Held Since Training, by Sex and Respondent Type 40

II.12 How Well Latest Job Liked, by Respondent Type 42

III.1 Wages on Last Full-time Job After Training, by Respondent Type 48

III.2 Background Variables Controlled in Multiple Regression Analyses 49

III.3 Family Income When Interviewed, by Respondent Type 54

III.4 Full-time and Part-time Employment When Interviewed, by Respondent Type 58

IV.1 Per Cent of Months Employed Full-time Between Training and Date of Interview, by Respondent Type 61

IV.2 Per Cent of Months Employed Full-time Between Training and Date of Interview, by Sex and Respondent Type 62

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table | Page

IV.3 Results From First Multiple Regression for Per Cent of Months Employed Full time After Training 65

IV.4 Net Effects of MDTA Training on Per Cent of Months Employed Full time After Training, in a Series of Multiple Regressions 76

IV.5 Full-time Employment Since Training, by Length of Training and Respondent Type 79

IV.6 Full-time Employment Since Training, by Type of Training and Respondent Type 81

IV.7 Mean Length of Training, by Type of Training and Respondent Type 84

A.1 Estimates for Standard Error of Proportions for Cluster Sample 111

A.2 Summary of Results from Multiple Regressions for Weekly Wages on Last Full-time Job Since Training 113

A.3 Variables Included in Multiple Regression Equations for Unemployment and Full-time Employment 114

A.4 Summary of Results from Multiple Regressions for Full-time Employment 115

A.5 Summary of Results from Multiple Regressions for Unemployment 116

A.6 Selected Items from the Employer's Questionnaire 120

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Purpose

Are the job training courses conducted under the Manpower Department and Training Act worthwhile for the trainees? This study is an evaluation of institutional MDTA training courses (in contrast to on-the-job training). Some of the testimony from former students is enthusiastic in support of the program.

> It was in carpentry line. Learning how to work with tools (thought I knew, but I didn't). Enjoyed every minute. Instructor was fabulous--patience he had. Had everything we wanted from the man. (Pennsylvania)

> It really did prepare me for a good office job. They covered everything--even good grooming. The instructors were very understanding. After all, I hadn't been working in 13 or 14 years, and I really needed to start from scratch. They gave us instruction in office machines, typing, shorthand; it was all very helpful. (Utah)

Negative testimony is also available. Some former students are quite willing to say what they didn't like about their MDTA training.

> They needed equipment; classes were crowded. (Tennessee)

> Because it's a waste of time. They don't train you for a job. (Illinois)

> I was very disappointed in it....Think they did a very poor selection of girls. Five to eight girls had no business being there....Girls came in drunk and were obscene and nothing was done about it.

> Several instances of girls fighting. Not what I was there for. Interesting, but took up a lot of time. (Ohio)

Since evaluations of MDTA training by individual trainees range from "fabulous" to "a waste of time," an investigator is not likely to get an accurate perspective on the entire program by talking to a few participants from a few training courses. This research surveys a nationwide probability sample of MDTA trainees large enough to establish a reasonable level of reliability for the results.[1]

The following kinds of information were sought from the sample of trainees and a control group of non-trainees: What difficulties had they experienced in finding jobs before the training? Why didn't unemployed non-trainees participate in available MDTA courses? How did trainees first hear about the MDTA program? What were their reasons for wanting to enter training? Why did many trainees drop out before the end of their courses? How well did trainees like their courses, and what, specifically, did they like or dislike about them? Did they feel they had really learned something in their training? If so, what? When leaving the MDTA program, how well qualified did they feel to begin the kinds of jobs for which they had taken training? Do they believe that their training actually helped them to get jobs? If so, how did it help, and if not, why not? How well did their training prepare them for their latest jobs? How well did they like their latest jobs? For those trainees and non-trainees not currently employed full time, why do they think they have not been able to find jobs? What have they done to find work? How much have they used the Employment Service? Under what conditions would they be willing to take a job in another city? Answers to these and other questions are given in Chapter II.

---

[1] For example, the proportion of trainees who said they learned to operate equipment is .71, with an estimated standard error of .027. Therefore, the 95 per cent confidence limits for the proportion are from .66 to .76. Estimated standard errors for other proportions are given in the appendix.

While the above questions are important for program planning--including recruitment, instruction, and later job referrals--they are not the major items in this evaluation of MDTA programs. A former student's opinion about his course is not necessarily a good indicator of how much be actually gained from it. Objective evidence from his post-training employment history should be considered, if possible.

The primary goal of this research is to obtain a nationwide picture of the effects of institutional MDTA training courses at least one year after their completion. After a year or more, is the typical former trainee in a better economic position than he would have been without the training? Does he earn more money, or has he experienced less unemployment? If so, by how much?[2]

Method

While it is relatively easy to examine objective data on income and employment before and after training to determine how much change occurred, it is quite another task to learn how much of the change is due to the MDTA program. If the amount of unemployment during the year after training is less than in the year before training, other factors might be responsible for the improvement, even in a static economy. The trainees would be a little older after the training and could have gained more experience in looking for jobs, if nothing else; either factor might increase chances for employment. And since this research was to be conducted at a time when the United States economy was booming and jobs were becoming easier to find, even less of any improvement in employment after training could be attributed to the training program itself. In a representative sample of MDTA trainees, the income and employment picture should be brighter in 1966 than in 1963 or 1964 because unemployment rates in the nation were lowered during that time. A simple comparison of situations before and after training is therefore of little value without some idea of what things would be like for the trainees if they had not participated in the MDTA program.

---

[2] Employers of trainees who found full-time jobs were contacted and asked to evaluate the trainees as employees. Because the employer evaluations are not an essential part of the research design, they are discussed only in the appendix.

Although it is impossible to determine what would have happened to an individual trainee if he had not enrolled in a job training course, one can make fairly accurate estimates of what would have happened to the trainees as a group by studying a control group of similar people. There are two classic methods of obtaining control groups of similar people. The first is to carefully match each trainee with a person similar in all relevant respects--age, sex, marital status, race, previous unemployment, education, place of residence, family size, etc. But what are the relevant variables? Perhaps some of those just mentioned are not very important and several others not mentioned are very closely related to employment. Even if all the relevant factors were known, the matching process would be too expensive, time-consuming, and difficult to be practical.

An easier method to assure that the control group is similar to the trainees is to set up an experimental situation in which the amount of difference between the two groups is very small and subject to known probabilities. This can be done by selecting a large national sample of unemployed people and randomly dividing them into two groups, so that any variations occur strictly by chance. One of the groups can then be given job training courses, and the other serves as the control group. Of course, some practical problems are also associated with this method, such as inducing all persons in one group to take job training courses and preventing all in the other group from doing so. But even disregarding such problems, the experimental technique could not be used, because this study concerns people who participated in job training courses which ended at least a full year earlier.

As a practical solution, a control group was obtained through a partial matching process which assured only rough similarity, with the intention of later taking into account whatever differences were observed between the trainees and the control group. When estimating the effects of MDTA training on income and employment, the differences in income and employment due to differences between the two groups would be isolated as much as possible--leaving the "net" effects of job training. Since the partial matching process required that a trainee in the sample be contacted before the corresponding control group person could be identified, the trainee sample will be discussed before describing the process used to select the control group.

Data Collection

The MDTA trainees to be included in the sample were selected from a list provided by the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training (now the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research) of the U.S. Department of Labor. Though the list was supposed to include only persons whose training courses ended in July, August, or September of 1964, it was later discovered that other persons were included; in order not to reduce the sample size too much, persons were regarded as eligible for this study if their MDTA courses ended between June 1, 1964 and February 28, 1965. Even though the addresses were more than a year old and many respondents had moved, the interviewers were able to locate and get information from nearly four-fifths (79 per cent) of the eligible trainees. Data were collected from about 1,200 trainees--nearly 800 who completed their courses and over 400 who dropped out before their courses ended.

The main sample also included another kind of respondent. People who had been referred to an MDTA job training course, but who failed to actually enroll and participate in the course, were interviewed as a special kind of control group. Since data were collected from only 136 such persons, they will not be discussed in detail; much of the analysis will not distinguish between this group and the larger control group.

Because the data were to be gathered in personal interviews rather than by self-administered questionnaires which could be distributed and collected by mail, it was more practical to use a cluster sample rather than a random sample of trainees. The larger number of persons who can be interviewed in a cluster sample for the same amount of money more than compensates for the larger sampling error in a cluster sample, compared to a random sample of the same size. Except in the South, where additional interviewers were obtained, it was possible to use regular interviewing staff of the

National Opinion Research Center located in 49 selected areas of the country. Details of the sampling procedure are described in the appendix.

Except for the small group in the main sample who were referred to MDTA courses but did not enroll, the control group was obtained through a "snowball" process, which implies a partial matching of control group persons to trainees. Trainees were asked if they knew of someone--friend, neighbor, relative--who was unemployed about the time they themselves began their job training. If they did, they were asked to provide names and addresses for up to three such people (in case the first one or two could not be found or turned out to be not eligible for this study). If an eligible control group person could not be obtained through this personal referral process, an alternate procedure was used. The interviewer began canvassing in the block where the trainee lived, looking for a person who was unemployed about the time the trainee's MDTA course started. If possible, the control group respondent was of the same sex as the corresponding trainee when either procedure was used. Aside from city of residence, sex, and dates of unemployment, the "matching" depended on the fact that since the trainee and the control group person were acquainted or lived in the same neighborhood they were likely to be similar in economic circumstances and perhaps in other ways. Of the 925 control group persons obtained by these partial matching procedures, 585 (63 per cent) were reached through personal referrals and 340 (37 per cent) by canvassing.

When the 136 who failed to enroll in courses to which they had been referred are added to these 925, the total number of non-trainees in the study is 1,061. Since there are 1,197 trainees in the sample (784 "completers," and 413 "dropouts"), the grand total of persons from whom data were collected is 2,258.[3]

Data collection was by means of a carefully structured personal interview. Trained interviewers were given detailed instructions on how to ask for the desired information. The 23-page interview schedule (questionnaire) for main sample respondents was filled out by the interviewer during the interview. A shorter form was used for the 925 control group respondents, with nearly all of the questions taken from the longer form. Both the main sample questionnaire and the control group questionnaire are included in the appendix.

Since this study was begun after the job training courses were over, it was not possible to interview the respondents both before and after the training. Instead, retrospective questions were asked. Since the interviews were conducted in the first three months of 1966, and employment histories were requested back to September, 1961, some of the earliest information is subject to errors of memory. This is another good reason for basing the analysis less on before vs. after training comparisons than on post-training comparisons of trainees and non-trainees.

Analysis

The first step in the analysis is to compare the trainees and the partially matched control group to see if they are indeed similar on background characteristics (education, age, family size, etc.) and on income and employment histories. Chapter II begins with these comparisons. The remainder of that chapter is devoted to answering many questions about the trainees, and the control group, including their experiences before, during, and after training. Most of those questions are subjective, though some objective information on employment is given.

---

[3] Though tables in this report have 2,258 as their grand total, they are actually constructed from data on 2,135 persons, with 123 of them counted twice to keep the sample representative. A box containing about 120 questionnaires was lost in transit before IBM cards were punched, but since the sample had been split into two subsamples it was possible to weight the odd-numbered questionnaires from the same locations by a factor of two to replace the lost even-numbered questionnaires.

The analytic discussions of the basic evaluative questions--the effects of MDTA training on income and on employment--are in Chapters III and IV, respectively. Two measures of income are considered, and four indicators of employment are used, though the discussion concentrates on only one of them. In each case, since the control group is not a perfect match for the sample of trainees, the effects of several other variables are controlled by multiple regression analysis when estimating the net effects of MDTA training.

In the discussion of training and employment, the problem of how to define the period "after training" for a non-trainee is important, because the indicators of employment refer to the amount of employment during that period rather than to employment status at only one point in time. The length and type of training are also considered to determine whether the number of days of participation or the occupational category has a significant effect on employment. "Dropouts" and "completers" are examined both together and separately regarding post-training employment. From the many regression equations used in this study, findings essential to the conclusions are included in the text; other results are listed only in the appendix.

CHAPTER II

COMPARISONS OF RESPONDENT TYPES

Since the major goal of the research involves differences between MDTA trainees and a control group of persons who did not take the training, it is important to know how similar the two groups are, except for the training experience and its consequences (if any). Those characteristics in which the two groups are considerably different should be controlled in evaluating employment experiences after training. Otherwise, observed differences in employment could depend less on the training than on the characteristic differences between trainees and the control group.

While the fundamental distinction is between trainees and the control group, there are actually four types of respondents which may be compared--(1) "completers," who either completed an MDTA training course or left the course to take a training-related job, (2) "dropouts," who started but did not complete the training, (3) "didn't enrolls," who were referred to a training course but did not enroll, and (4) "controls," who constituted the control group of unemployed neighbors, friends, or relatives of trainees. The third type--"didn't enrolls"--includes only 6 per cent of the respondents, making it less important and statistically less reliable than any of the other three respondent types.

No matter how many of the questionnaire items are used in comparisons of the respondent types, it is still possible that some other factors--

not necessarily in the questionnaire--could be the real cause of employment differences associated with training. However, all available variables conveivably capable of producing such differences will be examined. Most of these are demographic background characteristics. Comparisons of respondent types will also be made on employment history and on opinions and attitudes regarding training, jobs, and job hunting.

Background Characteristics

Sex

Though many women are household heads who need employment, the predominant pattern in our society is still for all able-bodied men to be employed full time while many women can either be full-time housewives or be employed only temporarily or part time to supplement the family income. Sex ratios would therefore be expected to influence later employment, even among persons in job training courses or the unemployed persons in the control group.

The matching process guaranteed that there would be little difference in the sex compositions of trainees and "controls"; interviewers were instructed to always attempt to obtain a control-group respondent of the same sex as the trainee. As a result, the proportion of males in the control group--62 per cent--was very close to the proportion of males among trainees--63 per cent. "Didn't enrolls" were also similar--61 per cent male. However, among trainees the male proportion is larger for "dropouts"--73 per cent--than for "completers"--58 per cent. Sex will be used as a control variable in evaluating training, even though "dropouts" are the only respondents who differ much from the mean, for all four respondent types, of 62 per cent male.

Race

Since many kinds of jobs have often been closed to Negroes in the past, and since racial discrimination is still an important factor in employment, the racial composition of trainees and "controls" is obviously important. Again, the method of selecting control-group persons assured at least some similarity between trainees and controls, because a neighbor, friend, or relative would usually be of the same race as the trainee. Since less than 1 per cent in each respondent type belonged to a race other than white or Negro, it is not necessary to have a category for "other." Practically all nonwhite persons are Negroes.

All four respondent types are close to the mean of 62 per cent white; the range is only from 60 per cent for "controls" to 63 per cent for "dropouts." But if the two sexes are considered separately, there are some differences in racial composition. Over two-thirds (69 per cent) of the men are white, compared to only one-half (49 per cent) of the women. Among men, the "didn't enrolls" have the smallest white proportion (61 per cent), with the other three respondent types grouped from 66 to 72 per cent. Among women, the "didn't enrolls" have the largest white proportion (62 per cent), with the others ranging from 44 per cent for "controls" to 55 per cent for "dropouts" ("completers" are 50 per cent white). Primarily because of the sex difference noted earlier, "dropouts" have more white men (48 per cent) and less nonwhite women (12 per cent) than any other respondent type. The association between sex and race is sufficient reason to use both as control variables in evaluating the effects of training.

Age

The oldest and the youngest job applicants have handicaps related to age--approaching retirement and pension for the oldest; lack of experience and immaturity for the youngest. The age distributions of trainees and "controls" are therefore of interest. While the selection process for the control group would not necessarily produce a similar age distribution, the resulting control group does resemble the trainees. The largest discrepancy is in the group aged 20 to 29 years,[1] which includes 39 per cent of trainees but only 29 per cent of "controls."

Of the four respondent types, "dropouts" are the youngest and "controls" are the oldest. While each type is concentrated in the youngest age groups, only among "dropouts" are a majority (54 per cent) under 25 years of age. The cumulative percentages in Table II.1 indicate that the proportions under 30 years of age range from one-half for "controls" to two-thirds for "dropouts." In each respondent type, women are younger than men. The greatest sex difference is among "controls," with 58 per cent of women and 44 per cent of men under 30 years of age. Of course, a comparison of female "dropouts" with male "controls" would reveal a larger difference (71 and 44 per cent, respectively, under 30 years of age). Enough difference exists to retain age as a control variable, even though the age distributions are roughly similar for the respondent types.

---

[1] All ages used in this report are as of the date training started--in 1964 for most respondents, and in 1963 for some.

TABLE II.1

AGE, BY RESPONDENT TYPE
(Cumulative Per Cent)

Age (Years)	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
10-19 . . .	18	27	20	20	20
20-29 . . .	56	66	55	49	55
30-39 . . .	72	80	76	66	72
40-49 . . .	88	92	93	84	88
50 or more	100	100	100	100	100
N . .	(773)	(406)	(130)	(917)	(2,226)

N 2,226
NA on age 32
Total N 2,258

Education

Unemployment is primarily a problem of the uneducated, which means that educational level is a crucial factor in any evaluation of job training. While a few respondents (7 per cent) reported some college experience, only 39 per cent completed high school. For each respondent type, the median educational level was that of a high-school dropout.

"Completers" have the highest educational level, and "controls" have the lowest in Table II.2. The proportions completing high school range from 49 per cent of "completers" to 32 per cent of "controls." Comparisons of those two groups would be misleading without controlling for education.

TABLE II.2

EDUCATION, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Years of School Completed	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
0 to 8 . .	21	23	19	34	27
9 to 11 . .	30	43	44	33	35
12 or more.	49	34	37	32	39
Total .	100	100	100	99	101
N . . .	(784)	(413)	(136)	(924)	(2,257)

N	2,257
NA on education . . .	1
Total N	2,258

While one-half (50 per cent) of the women respondents completed high school, only one-third (32 per cent) of the men did so. In each respondent type, the proportion who completed high school is higher for women than for men (the range is from 60 per cent for female "completers" to 28 per cent for male "dropouts" and for male "controls").

Marital Status

Since a married woman normally has a husband's wages to live on, and is not as likely to need a job as are men and women who must live on their own wages, marital status[2] could be related to employment--at least for women. However, the respondent types do not differ much on this variable;

---

[2] In this section, marital status is for the date of the interview.

all are close to the mean values of 59 per cent married, 27 per cent never married, and 14 per cent formerly married (divorced, widowed, or separated).

Both sexes have similar proportions never married, but 24 per cent of women were formerly married (compared to 8 per cent of men), and only 49 per cent of women are married (compared to 66 per cent of men). Among women, "completers" have the smallest proportion married (41 per cent) and the largest proportion formerly married (30 per cent, with "dropouts" nearly as high--28 per cent). Among men, "completers" have the largest proportion married (72 per cent). Since marital status does not reveal large differences across respondent types, it is not likely to be as important as the previous variables when attempting to isolate the influence of training from the effects of other characteristics.

Main Earner and Household Head

A person who is the main earner or household head[3] for a family is more likely to need employment than other members of his household. While "completers" have the largest proportions of main earners (48 per cent) and of household heads (52 per cent) and "didn't enrolls" have the smallest proportions of both (40 and 43 per cent, respectively), neither "dropouts" nor "controls" differ from "completers" by more than four percentage points on either proportion.

Larger differences exist among women, however, where 37 per cent of "completers" were main earners, compared to only 19 to 23 per cent for each of the other three respondent types. Similarly, household heads made up 33 per cent of female "completers" but only 17 to 23 per cent of other respondent types. At least for women, then, these appear to be useful control variables (only one of the two need be used, since most respondents are both or neither).

---

[3] These variables apply at the date training was started.

Number of Children

Since it takes more income to support a large family than a small one, respondents with several children might be more determined in their job seeking than those with few or no children. In order to exclude grown children who are not necessarily dependents of the respondents, only children never married and under 18 years old are counted here.[4] The majority of respondents (54 per cent) reported no children; 16 per cent had one; 19 per cent had two or three; and 12 per cent had four or more. The corresponding percentages in each of the four respondent types are within 2 per cent of the mean values for the extreme categories (no children, and four or more), and only slightly larger differences exist for the other two categories. This variable is not likely to be very important in analyses of employment after training.

Employment and Income History

Respondents were asked for detailed employment histories back to September, 1961--more than a four-year period. Several variables could be used to describe previous employment (*e.g.*, per cent of months employed full time, number of periods of unemployment, activity one year before training); the one selected has the advantage of being less remote in time than some, and therefore more reliable. The measure of previous employment to be used is the number of months of unemployment during the year just before training.

---

[4] Number of children determined as of the date training started.

Several measures of income are also available (*e.g.*, weekly wages just before training, one year before training, on the longest full-time job). Weekly wages for the last full-time job before training will be used as a measure of the respondent's earning power. Family income just before training will be used to reflect the respondent's standard of living--part of which was provided by another wage-earner in many families.

Unemployment in the Year before Training

Those who have had most success in finding work in the past have an experience advantage in getting jobs after training. One-half of the respondents were unemployed at least five months in the year before training. It is apparent from Table II.3 that the four respondent types have similar distributions of unemployment. "Controls" had the largest proportion unemployed the entire year and the smallest proportion never unemployed, but the differences are only slight. About one-third of the 19 per cent never unemployed must have worked only part time at least part of the year, because only 13 per cent were employed full time for the entire 12 months.

When looking at each sex separately, larger differences exist among women. Only 35 per cent of female "completers" were unemployed the entire year, compared to 51 per cent of "dropouts" and 47 per cent of "controls" and "didn't enrolls." And only 8 per cent of female "controls" were never unemployed, compared to 17 per cent of "completers" and 15 per cent of "dropouts." For women, at least, this appears to be a useful control variable.

TABLE II.3

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE YEAR BEFORE TRAINING, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Months of Unemployment	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
0	21	21	21	17	19
1 - 3 . .	26	27	27	24	25
4 - 11 . .	28	24	27	29	28
12 . . .	24	28	25	30	27
Total.	99	100	100	100	99
N . .	(621)	(323)	(111)	(733)	(1,788)

N	1,788
Not applicable[a]	470
Total N	2,258

---

[a] Out of school less than one year before training, or period of military service or unknown activity during the year.

Wages on Last Full-time Job before Training

Of the respondents who had a full-time job sometime between September, 1961, and the date training started, one-fourth (26 per cent) reported weekly wages of less than $50 on their last full-time job before training; one-half (53 per cent) earned less than $70; and three-fourths (76 per cent) received under $100. While 3 per cent earned $140 or more, more than one-half (55 per cent) were clustered between $40 and $89 a week. The four respondent types have roughly similar distributions in Table II.4, except that more "controls" (30 per cent) made at least $100 a week than did any other type (19 to 23 per cent). On the other hand, the proportion who had no full-time job from September, 1961, to the date training started was largest for "controls" (68 per cent as large as the number who reported wages, compared to 58 per cent or less for each of the other respondent types).

TABLE II.4

LAST FULL-TIME WAGES BEFORE TRAINING, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Weekly Wages	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Under $50 . . .	28	22	25	26	26
$50 to $69 . .	30	28	32	24	27
$70 to $99 . .	23	27	24	20	23
$100 or more .	19	23	20	30	24
Total.	100	100	101	100	100
N . .	(491)	(257)	(85)	(536)	(1,369)

N	1,369
Not applicable	838
NA	51
Total N	2,258

Men were more likely than women to have had a full-time job before training: 72 per cent of men and 48 per cent of women had one or more. Among those who reported full-time wages, women earned considerably less than men; 50 per cent of women and 16 per cent of men made under $50 a week; the corresponding proportions under $70 are 81 and 42 per cent, and for under $100 they are 96 and 67 per cent. Among women, "controls" earned slightly less than other respondent types (56 per cent of "controls" earned under $50, compared to 45 per cent of trainees); but among men, the opposite was true (40 per cent of "controls" earned at least $100, compared to less than 30 per cent of other types). Since there are some differences between trainees and the control group, this variable could be important when examining the relationship between training and wages after training. Unfortunately, 37 per cent of the respondents had no full-time job before training, which limits the usefulness of this variable.

Family Income before Training

Since many of the respondents were not the main earners in their households, economic level is reflected better by family income than by individual wages. Just before the training started, a majority (53 per cent) of the reported family incomes were less than $60 a week--which is only $3,120 a year. One-third (34 per cent) were less than $40 weekly, and three-fourths (73 per cent) were under $100 a week. A few of the 5 per cent in the $200 and over category probably reported monthly instead of weekly incomes, but most of the highest incomes resulted from more than one wage earner in the family. Table II.5 contains only small differences among the respondent types. The control group is similar to the trainees on family income before training.

Men reported lower family incomes than women (56 per cent under $60, compared to 47 per cent for women)--perhaps more of the women came from households with two or more wage earners. Among men, income distributions for trainees and "controls" are practically identical; among women, "controls" report higher incomes than "dropouts," who in turn are higher than "completers" (the percentages with at least $60 a week are "controls"--60, "dropouts"--52, and "completers"--47).

TABLE II.5

FAMILY INCOME BEFORE TRAINING, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Weekly Income	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Totals
Under $40 . .	36	34	38	31	34
$40 - $59 . .	20	17	22	18	19
$60 - $99 . .	18	23	19	22	21
$100 or more	26	26	21	28	27
Total	100	100	100	99	101
N . .	(717)	(391)	(125)	(841)	(2,074)

N	2,074
NA	184
Total N	2,258

What They Said about Training and Jobs

The previous sections have compared the different types of respondents on relatively objective facts such as age, education, unemployment, and income; subjective facts such as reasons for taking training or opinions about the value of training will be discussed below, along with other questions related to training and to finding employment.[5]

---

[5] Certain questions were asked of only one respondent type (e.g., "dropouts" were asked, "Why did you leave the training?"), and the replies cannot be compared for different respondent types, of course. Some of these items are included in this chapter, however, as part of that respondent type's outlook on training and jobs.

Finding Employment before Training

The trainees were asked, "...just before you heard about the training,...how good did you think your chances would have been of finding...any kind of job, without taking the training...?" Four out of ten (42 per cent) said "poor," and three out of ten (28 per cent) said "fair," making 71 per cent who indicated their chances were believed to be less than good. The proportions for "dropouts" were very close to those for "completers." The sexes differed only slightly, with female "dropouts" and male "completers" having the highest proportions who said "poor" (46 and 45 per cent, respectively).

Those who answered "fair" or "poor" to the above question were asked about the main reasons they found it difficult to get a job before they entered training. When pressed to select the single most important reason, the majority pointed to some lack in their job preparation--26 per cent lacked any skill, trade, or experience, 14 per cent indicated a lack of education, 12 per cent said they needed additional experience, 3 per cent were not qualified for the types of jobs they wanted, and 2 per cent said their skills were rusty because they hadn't worked for a long time. Some cited their age (8 per cent too old, and 2 per cent too young) or physical condition (4 per cent) as the major reason they couldn't get a job. Only a minority blamed the economy for lack of job opportunities: 12 per cent said there were few jobs of any kind available, 7 per cent said that no jobs were open in their types of work, and 3 per cent felt that the available jobs were not good enough.

The greatest differences by respondent type are for lack of education--named by 20 per cent of "dropouts" and only 10 per cent of "completers"--and the need for additional experience--by 15 per cent of "completers" and only 7 per cent of "dropouts." But the lack of a skill or trade was chosen most often by both types of trainees. Women were especially likely to say they lacked a skill or trade (34 per cent, compared to 22 per cent of men)--particularly the women who dropped out of the course (50 per cent). Men were more likely to say that few jobs of any kind were available (15 per cent, compared to 5 per cent of women).

Trainees were also asked, "Before training, how much confidence did you have in your ability to learn a new job and to hold it...?" One-half (50 per cent) replied that they had "a lot of confidence," and another one-fourth (27 per cent) said "some confidence"; 18 per cent answered "a little confidence," and 5 per cent said "no confidence at all." "Dropouts" reported somewhat more confidence than "completers": 58 and 46 per cent, respectively, claimed "a lot of confidence" (a relationship which was reversed after training--see Table II.10). Men expressed more confidence than women, with 57 per cent claiming "a lot," compared to 39 per cent of women.

Reasons for Taking or Not Taking Training

A list of nine reasons for wanting to take job training was read to all respondents, who indicated whether or not each reason applied to them. Except for the 1 per cent who said "no" to all nine reasons (3 per cent of "controls"), the respondents also selected one of the nine as the most important reason for their wanting to take training. The rank order of the top three "most important" reasons was: (1) "To get a job that was steady, regular employment"--31 per cent, (2) "To learn new work skills"--23 per cent, and (3) "To get a job that paid more money"--15 per cent.

While that rank order was different only for "didn't enrolls," the smaller differences for "controls" in Table II.6 are potentially more relevant for later analyses of the relationships between training and employment or income. "Controls" have the largest proportion who answered "more money" (20 per cent, compared to 11 per cent of "completers," 15 per cent of "dropouts," and 9 per cent of "didn't enrolls"), and the smallest proportion who said "new work skills" (19 per cent, compared to 25 per cent or more for other respondent types). The rank order of the top three reasons

TABLE II.6

MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR WANTING TRAINING, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Most Important Reason	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
To get a job in a different line of work	4	5	4	4	4
To learn new work skills . .	26	25	32	19	23
To get a job that paid more money	11	15	9	20	15
To get a more interesting job	5	4	4	5	5
To get a job that was steady, regular employment	30	30	24	33	31
To get an easier job	1	0	0	1	1
To improve my skills or knowledge for a job I already had	6	7	7	7	7
Just to get a job, no matter what it was	8	9	10	5	7
Other	8	6	12	6	7
Total	99	101	102	100	100
N	(769)	(405)	(135)	(887)	(2,196)

N	2,196
NA	33
Not applicable . . .	29
Total N	2,258

was the same for men and women separately, though women named "steady job" somewhat less often (27 per cent) than men (33 per cent) and women sought "more money" more often (19 per cent) than men (13 per cent).

Since control-group respondents were all unemployed about the time training programs were conducted nearby, why didn't they take the training? One-half (51 per cent) of them didn't know about the MDTA programs which they were probably eligible to attend. Over three-fourths (78 per cent) of those who didn't know about the programs said "yes," they would have been interested in taking job training at that time, and another 10 per cent said that it "depends"--on the type of training available, primarily, but also on the course hours, location, allowance, and other things.

Among those who did know about the programs, nearly three-fourths (73 per cent) said "yes," they were interested in taking job training at that time--in fact, 5 per cent actually took training (starting on different dates than the corresponding main sample respondents). The 302 other persons who said they were interested were asked why they did not take the course. Answers to that open-ended question were assigned to 21 categories, with an average of 1.2 answers per person. The most popular categories were: (1) "They told me I was not eligible, or would not accept me"--16 per cent; (2) "The class was full and they couldn't take anyone else"--15 per cent; (3) "I made application, but they never told me anything"--13 per cent; (4) "The available training was not the kind I wanted"--11 per cent; (5) "I thought that I was not eligible, or would not be accepted"--10 per cent; (6) "I got a job"--9 per cent; (7) "Family responsibilities, young children, couldn't get baby-sitter"--6 per cent; and (8) "Not interested enough to make effort of applying"--6 per cent.

All "controls" who said they were not interested in taking the training (27 per cent of those who knew about the programs and 12 per cent of those who did not) were asked why they weren't interested. Answers were assigned to 16 categories, with an average of 1.2 answers per person. The categories used most often were: (1) "I didn't need training; already qualified, but no jobs open, etc."--21 per cent; (2) "I wanted a job"--17 per cent; (3) "Didn't want the type of training available"--15 per cent; (4) "Too old"--11 per cent; (5) "Didn't want training--about to be on pension, don't believe in welfare state ideas, etc."--9 per cent; and (6) "Planning or engaged in other activity (school, military, jail, etc.)" --9 per cent.

How did respondents in the main sample first hear about the MDTA training? "Employment service interviewer" was named by 37 per cent. Since another 11 per cent answered "posting at Employment Service Office," the Employment Service was named by nearly one-half (48 per cent). About one-fifth listed a personal acquaintance as their first source of information (16 per cent said "friend," and 5 per cent said "parent or relative"). The next largest categories are "other" (13 per cent) and "newspaper" (11 per cent). The remaining categories are all small: "radio or television"--4 per cent, "welfare worker"--3 per cent, and "employer or company"--2 per cent (if newspapers and broadcasting are considered together, the mass-communications media account for 15 per cent of the responses). The three respondent types ("controls" were not asked this question) have similar percentage distributions.

When asked if they were referred to the type of training they really wanted, seven out of ten (71 per cent) said "yes." The percentages were similar for each respondent type: "completers"--72, "dropouts"--68, and "didn't enrolls"--71. Among those who said "no," two-thirds (68 per cent) said they had asked for their first choice. But a majority (61 per cent) of those who had asked also said the course of their choice was not being offered at any school near them at that time. Most of the others (whose choices were being offered then) could not get into the course of their choice because the class was full, they were not qualified, or the course had started earlier. Among those who didn't even ask for their first choice, most believed that it was not available; about one-third believed that the type of training they were referred to was the only type available.

Since 71 per cent of the "didn't enrolls" said that they were referred to the type of training they really wanted, what reasons did they have for not enrolling? Though multiple responses were permitted (averaging nearly 1.4 per person), only 7 per cent said that they didn't enroll because they didn't want some course they were offered. Of the 17 categories to which answers were assigned, the largest was that they got jobs or were called back to work--31 per cent. Transportation problems (other than costs of transportation) were named by 15 per cent, and family responsibilities were mentioned by 11 per cent. At least one of the five financial reasons (general, transportation or cost of lunches, needed a job before the course would end, not eligible for allowance, allowance too small) was listed by 28 per cent, though the largest proportion choosing any single financial reason was the 10 per cent who said the allowance was too small. Communication with the Employment Service was poor for some, because 10 per cent didn't realize at the time (some still didn't know when interviewed) that they had actually been referred for a training course. The time schedule was not suitable to 7 per cent, and the remaining reasons were each given by fewer persons.

Only 8 per cent of "didn't enrolls" said they were offered another type of training at the time they didn't enroll, but since only 7 per cent objected to a particular course, this doesn't appear to be a major stumbling block. When asked, "Considering everything that's happened to you since then, do you think it would have been better if you had taken the course?" over one-half (55 per cent) said "yes" (37 per cent said "no," and 7 per cent said they didn't know).

A majority (55 per cent) of "didn't enrolls" claimed that they were still interested in government-sponsored training (28 per cent said "no," and 16 per cent said it "depends"). When "controls" were asked if they were interested in taking training to learn a skill or trade, three-fourths (75 per cent) said "yes." When the one-fourth who said "no" were asked, "Why not?" a majority of them said they had jobs.

Since two-thirds of the "dropouts" were taking the type of training they "really wanted," why didn't they complete their courses? Multiple responses were given--an average of 1.2 reasons per person. Not many of those who left MDTA training courses did so because they were critical of the program. Only 6 per cent expressed dissatisfaction with the instructors, and only 13 per cent disliked something else about the program. Many dropped out for financial reasons: 25 per cent took a job for financial reasons, 12 per cent mentioned inadequate allowance or other money problems, and 10 per cent said they left to take a job, though financial reasons were not specified (43 per cent gave at least one of these three reasons). Personal illness was a reason for 12 per cent, 10 per cent referred to family problems, and 7 per cent spoke of transportation difficulties.

Men and women generally gave different reasons for dropping out of training. For women, aside from the 38 per cent in the residual "other" category, the reasons listed most often were illness (25 per cent) and family problems (21 per cent), with each other reason given by less than 10 per cent. For men, the most popular reason for leaving was to take a job (31 per cent mentioned financial reasons in connection with the job, and 11 per cent did not). Except for 24 per cent "other," the next most frequent reasons were dissatisfaction with the training (8 per cent disliked the instructors and 16 per cent disliked something else) and money problems (13 per cent).

How many respondents took other job-training courses later? The proportion for "completers"--11 per cent--is slightly smaller than for others--16 or 17 per cent for each other respondent type. The proportions are very similar for men and women separately. Trainees who had not taken another course later were asked if they are planning to take some other kind of job training. About three out of ten said "yes"--28 per cent of completers and 31 per cent of dropouts. The corresponding percentages were slightly higher for women (31 and 35 per cent) than for men (26 and 30 per cent).

Evaluations of Training

Looking back on their training experience at least a year later (at least 17 months later for a majority of "completers," and 20 or more months for a majority of "dropouts"), what did the trainees have to say about it? When asked, "All things considered, how well did you like the training...?" a majority (57 per cent) answered "very well," and only 10 per cent said "not so well" or "not at all." As expected, "completers" liked it better than "dropouts" did--63 per cent of "completers" and 45 per cent of "dropouts" said "very well," while the corresponding percentages saying "not so well" or "not at all" were 5 and 19. Women liked the training more often than men, and Table II.7 shows that, within each sex, "completers" liked their courses more than "dropouts" did.

Trainees who liked their courses at least "fairly well" were asked to specify what they liked about the training. The multiple responses were assigned to 14 categories, with an average of 1.9 answers per person (2.0 for "completers" and 1.7 for "dropouts"). One-third (34 per cent) liked learning something (36 per cent of "completers" and 31 per cent of "dropouts"), and one-fourth (27 per cent) said the subject matter was interesting. Appreciation was expressed for the teacher's method of communicating the subject by 22 per cent, the teacher's knowledge of the subject by 4 per cent, and the teacher in general or as a person by 20 per cent (at least one of those thr types of responses was given by 42 per cent). One-fifth (21 per cent) liked

TABLE II.7

HOW WELL TRAINING WAS LIKED, BY SEX AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

How Well Training Was Liked	Male		Female		Total	
	Completers	Dropouts	Completers	Dropouts	Completers	Dropouts
Very well . .	60	43	68	49	63	45
Fairly well .	34	34	28	41	31	36
Not so well .	4	7	3	6	3	7
Not at all .	2	15	1	4	2	12
Total .	100	99	100	100	99	100
N . . .	(455)	(299)	(328)	(110)	(783)	(409)

N	1,192
NA	5
Not applicable	1,061
Total N	2,258

the practical experience (24 per cent of "completers" and 15 per cent of "dropouts"), and the same proportion (21 per cent) simply liked everything about the training (24 per cent of "completers" and 14 per cent of "dropouts"). Association with other people was mentioned by 13 per cent, and doing something new or different was named by 12 per cent. The remaining five categories each contained 8 per cent or less. The largest sex differences occurred for liking everything about training (26 per cent of women, 18 per cent of men) and for associating with other people (21 per cent of women, 9 per cent of men).

Trainees who liked their courses "not so well" or "not at all" were asked to specify what they disliked about the training. With an average of 1.6 answers per person and 21 categories, no single category was used for as many as one-fifth of those responding. One out of nine (11 per cent) said that there was nothing they disliked. The categories with the largest number of choices are (1) the training stressed the wrong, or unimportant, things--18 per cent; (2) the course was too short--14 per cent; (3) not enough equipment or supplies were available when needed--14 per cent; (4) the teacher's ability or methods were not good enough--12 per cent; and (5) poor planning, curriculum, or organization--12 per cent. Combining the 12 per cent in item 4, above, with the fact that 8 per cent disliked the teachers' attitudes toward students or toward the program gives us a total of 19 per cent[6] who disliked something about the instructions. The largest differences by respondent type were for the following: (1) the course was too short--21 per cent of "completers" and 6 per cent of "dropouts"; (2) the training stressed the wrong things--23 per cent of "completers" and 13 per cent of "dropouts"; and (3) the allowance was too small--3 per cent of "completers" and 10 per cent of "dropouts." Distributions were similar for both sexes, with the largest difference in the complaint

---

[c] Total is 19 per cent rather than 20 per cent because of multiple responses.

that there was not enough equipment or supplies--17 per cent of men and 8 per cent of women.

All trainees were asked to say whether or not they learned certain types of skills in their MDTA training. Seven out of ten said "yes," they learned how to operate equipment, and six out of ten said "yes," they learned how to use tools. Six out of ten also said "yes," they learned to read and write better or to do arithmetic. For each of those three types of skills, Table II.8 shows that "completers" said "yes" more often than "dropouts" did, the greatest difference being on the equipment question (80 per cent *vs.* 52 per cent). Sex differences are shown in the same table: men have a much higher percentage than women on the tools question (75 per cent *vs.* 29 per cent), and women have slightly higher percentages than men on the equipment

TABLE II.8

SELECTED SKILLS LEARNED IN TRAINING, BY SEX AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent Learning Skill)

Skill	Sex	Respondent Type		
		Completers	Dropouts	Total
Operate equipment	Male . .	82 (454)[a]	49 (297)	69 (751)
	Female .	77 (328)	59 (108)	73 (436)
	Total. .	80 (782)	52 (405)	71 (1,187)
Use tools	Male ·	84 (455)	62 (298)	75 (753)
	Female ·	31 (325)	21 (107)	29 (432)
	Total· ·	62 (780)	51 (405)	58 (1,185)
Reading, writing, or arithmetic	Male . .	58 (452)	52 (298)	56 (750)
	Female .	66 (328)	56 (110)	63 (438)
	Total. .	61 (780)	53 (408)	58 (1,188)

	Equipment	Tools	Reading...
N.	1,187	1,185	1,188
NA	10	12	9
Not applicable	1,061	1,061	1,061
Total N	2,258	2,258	2,258

---

[a] Numbers in parentheses--just below and to the right of each percentage are the percentage bases; *e.g.*, male "completers" who learned to operate equipment constitute 82 per cent of the 454 male completers who answered the question.

and basic-education questions. In the cross-tabulations of sex and respondent type, the same relationships exist with one exception--among "completers," the proportion who learned to operate equipment was slightly higher for men than for women.

In addition to the general types of skills discussed above and the more specific job skills which are particularly useful in the various occupations for which the training was given, the following "skills" were learned, according to open-ended responses of the trainees: (1) personal relationships, or getting along with other people--9 per cent; (2) psychological well being or feelings of confidence or independence--4 per cent; (3) personal appearance, grooming or posture--3 per cent; and (4) how to look for or apply for a job--2 per cent.[7] Personal relationships were named slightly more often by "completers" (11 per cent) than by "dropouts" (5 per cent). Women were a little more likely than men to mention personal relationships (12 per cent _vs_. 7 per cent) and personal appearance (7 per cent _vs_. 1 per cent).

A majority (64 per cent) of trainees said that the new skills they learned were ones they had expected to learn, but 18 per cent said they had not expected to learn those skills, and another 18 per cent said some were skills they expected and some were not. Therefore, one-third (36 per cent) learned something they were not expecting to learn; the proportion was slightly larger for "completers" (38 per cent) than for "dropouts" (32 per cent). Similar proportions exist for men and women separately: the largest sex difference is for dropouts who learned something unexpected--33 per cent of men and 27 per cent of women.

---

[7] Those trainees who gave no answer are included in the percentage base for this question about _additional_ new skills.

When they left training, how well qualified to begin the kind of job for which they had taken training did the trainees feel? While a majority (55 per cent) felt well qualified, "completers" naturally felt qualified more often than "dropouts." For the two extreme categories (Table II.9) "completers" felt "very well qualified" three times as often as "dropouts" (36 per cent _vs_. 12 per cent), and "dropouts" said they were "not qualified at all" far more often than "completers" (37 _vs_. 4 per cent). The percentages feeling at least "well qualified" were 67 for "completers" and 31 for "dropouts." Women felt better qualified than men did; women said "very well" more often than men (34 _vs_. 24 per cent), and men said "somewhat" more often than women (33 _vs_. 23 per cent). Among "completers," a similar sex difference exists, with more women than men in the "very well" category (42 _vs_. 32 per cent); but among "dropouts," more women than men felt "not qualified at all" (43 _vs_. 35 per cent).

Did training help them get jobs? Two-thirds (66 per cent) of "completers" and one-fourth (26 per cent) of "dropouts" said that the MDTA training they received helped them obtain employment (53 per cent for both respondent types combined). The proportion who said "yes" was larger for women (59 per cent) than for men (49 per cent). Among "completers," women found training helpful more often (73 per cent, compared to 62 per cent of men), but among "dropouts," men were a little more likely than women to say training helped them get a job (28 _vs_. 21 per cent).

Trainees who said "no" (the training did not help them find employment) were asked why it did not. Only 10 per cent explicitly blamed the training program. The answers given most often by "completers" were: (1) there were no jobs open--35 per cent; (2) took a job not related to the training or for which the training wasn't needed--29 per cent; and (3) deficiencies of the

TABLE II.9

HOW WELL QUALIFIED FOR OCCUPATION WAS RESPONDENT AFTER TRAINING, BY SEX AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Sex	How Well Qualified	Respondent Type		
		Completers	Dropouts	Total
Male	Very well	32	13	24
	Well.	32	19	27
	Somewhat.	33	34	33
	Not at all. . . .	3	35	16
	Total. . . .	100	101	100
	N.	(452)	(295)	(747)
Female	Very well	42	11	34
	Well.	31	21	29
	Somewhat.	22	25	23
	Not at all. . . .	5	43	14
	Total. . . .	100	100	100
	N.	(327)	(110)	(437)
Total	Very well	36	12	28
	Well.	31	19	27
	Somewhat.	29	32	30
	Not at all. . . .	4	37	15
	Total. . . .	100	100	100
	N.	(779)	(405)	(1,184)

N.	1,184
NA	13
Not applicable . .	1,061
Total N . . .	2,258

training program--14 per cent. (While multiple responses were permitted, only 14 extra answers were given by the 524 persons who answered the question.) "Dropouts" said: (1) not in the course long enough to benefit from it--52 per cent; (2) took a job not related to the training or for which the training wasn't needed--22 per cent; and (3) not looking for full-time work--8 per cent (other categories had smaller percentages). Men were more likely than women to report taking a job not related to the training (30 _vs_. 15 per cent). Women were more likely than men to say they were not looking for full-time work (13 _vs_. 2 per cent)--19 per cent of women "dropouts."

Trainees who said "yes" (the training did help them find employment) were asked to specify how the training helped. About one-half (52 per cent) said it helped by teaching a new skill or by improving an existing skill. Other responses were: the employer knew the training had been taken--16 per cent; a referral was made by MDTA or the Employment Service--13 per cent; the training helped when taking a test--9 per cent; the course prepared trainees for an occupation with many job openings--7 per cent; and the training program taught how to look for a job--4 per cent. (Only 20 extra answers were given by the 591 persons answering this multiple-response question.) Learning how to look for a job was mentioned more often by "dropouts" (11 per cent) than by "completers" (3 per cent), but the two respondent types had similar distributions for the other response categories. Men and women also had similar response patterns.

When asked how well the MDTA training prepared them for their latest job, nearly one-half (47 per cent) said "not well at all." One-fourth (25 per cent) said "fairly well," and one-fourth (28 per cent) said "very well." While "dropouts" were more likely to say "not well at all" (71 per cent), even among "completers" the proportion was one out of three (35 per cent).

But the reason is simple; 90 per cent of "completers" who said the training was no preparation for their latest job were referring to a different line of work--not related to the training. For "dropouts" the corresponding proportion is 64 per cent, and the next highest reasons were that they didn't stay in the course long enough--26 per cent--or that they learned little or nothing new in the course--6 per cent (only 23 extra responses were given by the 512 persons who answered this multiple-response question). Among "completers," women were more likely than men to say the training prepared them "very well" for their latest job (42 *vs*. 32 per cent) and less likely than men to say "not well at all" (29 *vs*. 39 per cent). No appreciable sex difference exists for "dropouts."

An indirect evaluation of the training is provided by the comparison in Table II.10 between confidence before training and confidence after training. Since more than a year elapsed between "before training" and "now" (when interviewed), the change in confidence is not necessarily due to the training, of course. Other things have happened during that time--such as

TABLE II.10

AMOUNT OF CONFIDENCE IN ABILITY TO LEARN AND HOLD A NEW JOB
BEFORE TRAINING AND NOW, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Amount of Confidence	Before Training			Now		
	Respondent Type			Respondent Type		
	Completers	Dropouts	Total	Completers	Dropouts	Total
A lot.	46	58	50	79	72	77
Some	30	22	27	18	21	19
A little	19	16	18	3	6	4
None	5	5	5	1	2	1
Total . . .	100	101	100	101	101	101
N	(781)	(410)	(1,191)	(781)	(410)	(1,191)

	Before Training	Now
N	1,191	1,191
NA.	6	6
Not applicable . .	1,061	1,061
Total N . . .	2,258	2,258

actual job experiences--which could also lead to increased confidence. However, it does seem reasonable to expect training to result in increased confidence in one's "ability to learn a new job and to hold it" (quoted from the questionnaire), and therefore "completers" should benefit more than "dropouts." While only 46 per cent of "completers" had "a lot" of confidence before training, 79 per cent expressed "a lot" when interviewed--an increase of 33 per cent. For "dropouts" the corresponding increase was only 14 per cent (from 58 to 72 per cent). Though "dropouts" had more confidence than "completers" had before training, "completers" held a slight advantage afterward. Women and men expressed roughly similar levels of confidence when interviewed, which means that women gained more since before training--when men had a definite advantage. Female "completers" gained the most--their proportion with "a lot" of confidence rose from 39 per cent before training to 79 per cent "now"--a rise of 40 per cent (male "completers" rose from 51 to 79 per cent--a gain of 28 per cent).

Finding Employment after Training

Much of what the respondents said about finding employment after training has already been discussed in connection with evaluations of training --questions such as whether the training helped them to obtain employment and how or why not. This section will include most of the other questions dealing with finding suitable jobs after training.

All "completers" were asked how many employers they were referred to by the Employment Service during the month after training. A majority (56 per cent) were referred to at least one, and one-fourth (25 per cent) were referred to two or more. The proportion receiving referrals was a little higher for women (60 per cent) than for men (53 per cent), but two or more referrals were received by about one-fourth of each sex.

The 347 "completers" who said they were not referred were asked, "Why didn't they refer you to any employers?" While such a question requires some respondents either to speculate or give no answer (83 of the 347 gave no relevant answer), some information is available from the responses. The most common reason given was that no referral was needed (already working or plenty of jobs available)--42 per cent; 16 per cent said that there were no more jobs related to their training available at that time; 14 per cent cited a general scarcity of jobs; and 8 per cent said they were not qualified for available jobs (only 4 extra responses were given by the 264 persons answering this multiple-response question). Men said more often than women that no more training-related jobs were available (20 vs. 10 per cent), but other sex differences were very small.

Four out of five respondents (80 per cent) reported having at least one full-time job since training. The proportion varies greatly by sex and respondent type. Table II.11 shows that "controls" were less successful in finding jobs (69 per cent) than other respondent types (83 to 89 per cent), and that fewer women (68 per cent) than men (87 per cent) had full-time jobs.

TABLE II.11

FULL-TIME JOBS HELD SINCE TRAINING, BY SEX AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent Holding at Least One Full-time Job)

Sex	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Male...	93 (455)	91 (300)	90 (83)	79 (572)	87 (1,410)
Female.	84 (329)	64 (113)	72 (53)	54 (353)	68 (848)
Total.	89 (784)	84 (413)	83 (136)	69 (925)	80 (2,258)

For men, the range is from 93 per cent of "completers" to 79 per cent of "controls"; for women, it is from 84 per cent of "completers" to only 54 per cent of "controls Male "dropouts" and "didn't enrolls" had nearly as many jobs as "completers," but female "dropouts" and "didn't enrolls" were close to the middle of the female range for the four respondent types. In each sex, "completers" were more likely to find work than "controls" were, but only for women was failure to complete the training (for which selected or enrolled) associated with difficulty in obtaining employment. Despite the large percentage differences between "completers" and "controls" in Table II.11, it is not possible to say with assurance at this point that the training program helped its graduates to get jobs. Perhaps some of the previously noted differences between the two groups (such as educational level or age) are responsible for differences in employment. The following chapters will examine such problems.

Were those who found employment able to find jobs that they liked? Of those who had one or more full-time jobs since training, most claimed that they liked their latest job: 54 per cent said "very well," and another 32 per cent said "fairly well." Only 6 per cent said "not well at all," and 8 per cent said "not so well." Men and women had similar response patterns, but there was a large difference related to respondent type. Only 42 per cent of "controls" liked their most recent jobs "very well," compared to 62 per cent of "completers," 59 per cent of "dropouts," and 55 per cent of "didn't enrolls" (Table II.12). Not only did fewer "controls" find full-time work--they didn't like the jobs they did find as well as trainees did.

A series of questions related to job-seeking was asked only of persons who were not employed full time when interviewed. These are discussed

TABLE II.12

HOW WELL LATEST JOB LIKED, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

How Well Latest Job Liked	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Very well . . .	62	59	55	42	54
Fairly well . .	27	29	30	40	32
Not so well . .	7	5	10	11	8
Not well at all	5	7	5	7	6
Total . .	101	100	100	100	100
N . . .	(693)	(345)	(109)	(630)	(1,777)

N	1,777
NA	21
Not applicable[a] . . .	460
Total N	2,258

[a] No full-time job since training.

in the remainder of this section. The reader should remember that the findings reported below are limited to respondents not working full time on the dates they were interviewed.

When asked how much of the time since training they had been available for a full-time job, 17 per cent said "not at all." The proportion never available was smaller for "controls" (13 per cent) than for "completers" (23 per cent) or "dropouts" (22 per cent). More women (23 per cent) than men (12 per cent) were never available. Male "controls" were most available--only 7 per cent "not at all"available (vs. 24 per cent for male "completers"). Since more "completers" than "controls" were never available for full-time jobs, the association between training and employment is really stronger than it appears in Table II.11. When asked why they had not been available for jobs, most women mentioned family responsibilities; men cited their physical condition more often than any other reason.

Open-ended responses did not all fit into a precoded answer list for the question, "Why do you think you haven't been able to find a job?" The most popular category on this multiple-response item was the residual one--"other" (52 per cent). The next most popular categories were "no jobs available for which I qualify" (34 per cent) and "employers want more experience than I have" (30 per cent). Relatively few persons said "slack period in industry or jobs where I qualify" (16 per cent) or "jobs not available because of my age" (13 per cent). Even smaller proportions said "jobs refused by me because of low wages" (7 per cent), "employer's prejudice or discrimination" (5 per cent), or "not a union member" (2 per cent). The only notable difference by respondent type was for "completers," of whom a smaller proportion had said "no jobs available for which I qualify" (25 per cent--_vs_. 37 per cent for "controls"). Women mentioned the need for more experience more often than men did (36 _vs_. 26 per cent), and men were more prone than women to list age (17 _vs_. 8 per cent) or slack period in their field (20 _vs_. 11 per cent).

When asked to specify which was the most important reason, the respondents still gave "other" answers most often (41 per cent), again followed by "no jobs available for which I qualify" (19 per cent) and "employers want more experience than I have" (18 per cent), with the remaining categories each chosen by 9 per cent or less. As before, the only category with much difference between respondent types was "no jobs available for which I qualify" --selected by 21 per cent of "controls," 16 per cent of "completers," and 12 per cent of "dropouts." Women cited their lack of experience more often than men did (24 vs. 12 per cent), and men were a little more likely than women to mention age (10 vs. 4 per cent) or a slack period in their field (12 vs. 5 per cent).

Two-thirds (69 per cent) of those not then holding a full-time position thought their chances of getting a job then were only "fair" (32 per cent) or "poor" (37 per cent); 20 per cent said "good" and 11 per cent said "very good." "Completers" thought a little more of their chances than "controls" did, with more in the "very good" category (15 vs. 9 per cent) and fewer in the "poor" category (27 vs. 42 per cent). Men said "poor" more often than women did (42 vs. 33 per cent), and within each sex "completers" thought their chances a little better than "controls" thought theirs.

The most popular responses to "What have you done to try to get a job?" were: "registered at public employment office" (54 per cent) and "applied to employers in this area" (52 per cent); an average of 2.2 responses per person were given on this question. The next highest categories were "asked friends and/or relatives" (35 per cent) and "answered newspaper ads" (27 per cent). Though 14 per cent had done "nothing" to find a job, this is not surprising, because 17 per cent said they had not been available for a full-time job since training. Smaller proportions said they had "applied to employers outside this area" (12 per cent), "registered at a private employment office" (11 per cent), or "applied to union" (3 per cent).

Responses were distributed similarly by respondent type, with the largest difference for "asked friends and/or relatives"--28 per cent of "completers" and 39 per cent of "controls." Men were a little more likely than women to use public employment offices (60 vs. 47 per cent) and to apply to employers in the area (58 vs. 46 per cent) or out of the area (16 *vs*. 7 per cent), while slightly more women than men did nothing to find work (18 *vs*. 10 per cent). Among men, public employment offices were used by more "completers" (69 per cent) than "controls" (57 per cent). Among women, friends or relatives were asked by fewer "completers" (21 per cent) than "controls" (39 per cent).

When asked how frequently they had checked with the local employment office, 35 per cent said at least once a month (including 20 per cent who said at least weekly); 31 per cent said "never." "Completers" were more likely than others to use the employment office: 23 per cent said "never," compared to 32 per cent of "controls" and 35 per cent of "dropouts." The proportion checking every week was higher for "completers" (27 per cent) than for "controls" or "dropouts" (each 18 per cent), as was the proportion checking at least monthly (45 per cent, *vs*. 32 for "controls" and 33 for "dropouts"). Men used employment offices more than women: 25 per cent of men and 37 per cent of women said "never." More men than women checked monthly (43 *vs*. 27 per cent), including those who checked at least weekly (24 per cent of men and 14 per cent of women). Within each sex, "completers" used the local employment offices more than "controls" or "dropouts."

Those who said "never" or "less often than once a month" to the previous question were asked, "Why haven't you kept in touch (more often)?" The open-ended responses did not fit the precoded categories very well, with one-half (51 per cent) of the respondents included in the residual "other" category. Of the five specific reasons, the most popular was "they have no jobs for me" (35 per cent); multiple responses were permitted, with an average of 1.1 per person. Relatively few said they were "not interested in full-time job" (10 per cent) or didn't keep in touch more because of "personal illness" (9 per cent). No notable differences existed among the respondent types. More men than women said "they have no jobs for me" (43 vs. 27 per cent), and women were a little more likely to say they were not interested in a full-time job (14 vs. 6 per cent).

How much did those without full-time employment really want to find a job? Enough to take a job in another city? Two-thirds (67 per cent) said "yes" if the wage rate was higher than they were accustomed to, and one-half (50 per cent) said "yes" if the wages were the same as they were used to, but only 14 per cent would move if the wages were lower than they were accustomed to. "Completers," "dropouts," and "controls" had similar proportions on these questions. Men were much more willing to move to another city than women were--whether for higher wages (80 vs. 51 per cent), wages the same as they were used to (62 vs. 35 per cent), or lower wages (20 vs. 6 per cent).

This chapter has compared the four types of respondents on many variables: first, to determine how similar were members of the control group to the trainees, and on which variables there were differences to be controlled in evaluating the "effects" of training on employment, and second, to see how different respondents viewed job training and job hunting. Much of the latter consisted of subjective reactions to the training experience. The following chapters return to the objective data on income and employment, using various control variables in the analyses to isolate the "effects" of training. The comparisons in this chapter showed that, in general, the control group was similar to the trainees. But some variables, such as age and education, did exhibit large enough differences to necessitate holding them constant in further analyses.

CHAPTER III

TRAINING AND INCOME

Did the training result in higher incomes? If so, how much higher? While the basic goals of the MDTA program focus on altering the employment experience of the individual, increased earning power would be an important additional benefit of the program.

When evaluating the effects of training on income, the results depend on which particular measurements of income are used. The first section of this chapter considers current or recent wages from full-time jobs, and is therefore limited to persons who found full-time employment; the latter section deals with total family income, including part-time jobs and income produced by other family members. In contrast to the brief discussions of many topics in the previous chapter, this chapter (and the next) will analyze fewer dependent variables in greater detail.

Weekly Wages

The evidence does not indicate that MDTA training generally resulted in higher paying jobs. "Completers" and "controls" reported about the same wages on their last full-time job since training, with

8

six out of ten earning less than $80 a week (Table III.1).[1] Among women, however, training is associated with higher wages: two-thirds (66 per cent) of female "controls" earned less than $60 a week, compared to less than one-half (47 per cent) of "completers." But this association among women might result more from the effects of other variables than from the training experience.

TABLE III.1

WAGES ON LAST FULL-TIME JOB AFTER TRAINING, BY RESPONDENT TYPE
(Per Cent)

Weekly Wages	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Under $60 . .	30	25	30	35	31
$60 - $79 . .	29	30	33	24	28
$80 - $99 . .	19	18	15	15	17
$100 or more.	23	27	22	26	25
Total . . .	101	100	100	100	101
N	(672)	(334)	(108)	(590)	(1,704)

N	1,704
NA	94
Not applicable . .	460
Total N	2,258

---

[1] The basic dependent variable in this analysis is the most recent figure available for wages on a full-time job held since training, whether that be only one month after training, or twenty or more months later. By considering wages on the last full-time job after training, more people can be included in the analysis than if the dependent variable were fixed at a particular time, such as twelve months after training or on the date of the interview (because more people had a full-time job at least sometime after training than at any specified date).

Rather than considering sex, education, age, and other variables individually, several variables which might affect income will be controlled simultaneously by applying multiple regression analysis. The list of variables called "background" variables in Table III.2 will be controlled in each regression of wages.[2]

TABLE III.2

BACKGROUND VARIABLES CONTROLLED IN MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES

1. Sex.
2. Education (number of years of school completed).
3. Age (when training started).
4. Race (white *vs*. nonwhite).
5. Previous unemployment (number of months in the year before training).
6. Whether respondent was main earner of household (when training started).
7. Geographic region (South *vs*. non-South).
8. Marital status (when training started: never married, now married, formerly married--including separated).
9. Number of unmarried children of the respondent under 18 years old in household (when training started).
10. Per capita annual income of state (an index number proportional to the income reported by the U.S. Census Bureau for 1963).

---

[2] Except for the last variable listed (state per capita income), each "background" variable will be handled by a "dummy variable" technique, by which each category becomes a variable with only two categories. For example, previous unemployment (variable number 5 in Table III.2) will be divided into four categories: (1) 0 months, (2) 1 to 3 months, (3) 4 to 11 months, and (4) 12 months. Each of those categories is regarded as a variable for which a person is given the value of one if he falls into the category and zero if he does not. From the resulting set of four dummy variables on previous unemployment, only three are included as independent variables in the regression equation. In each set of dummy variables, the omitted one is the basis for comparisons. If the last one (12 months of unemployment) is omitted, then the equation will show how much change in weekly wages is associated with having 0 months of unemployment rather than 12 (while controlling for the other variables in the equation), and similarly, how much change is associated with having 1 to 3 months or

The equation used to represent the multiple regression analysis takes this form:

$$y = c + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + \ldots + b_nx_n$$

The dependent variable being predicted is y (which represents weekly wages on last full-time job after training), and the independent variables are represented by $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n$ (the "background" variables plus any other variables, including some indication of MDTA training). The independent variables have corresponding coefficients, $b_1, b_2, b_3, \ldots, b_n$. All of them, along with c, are constants determined by the regression analysis in a manner that will produce the equation best able to predict the dependent variable for a person in the population from which the sample was taken. In other words, the best available estimate of weekly wages for a trainee not in the sample would be determined by inserting that person's known characteristics $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ into the regression equation and solving for y.

Since the aim of this study is not to determine the most important variables in predicting income or employment but to evaluate the effect of one variable (MDTA training) on income or employment, the remaining variables need not be discussed individually. Therefore, the regression equation may be thought of in the form $y = c + b_1x_1 + B$.

The "background" variables and their coefficients have been put in a group represented by B in the equation. MDTA training is represented by x_1 in this equation. A person who took the training is given

---

4 to 11 months rather than 12 months. The omission of one dummy variable does not mean that any information is lost, since each person's score on that variable can easily be determined from his scores on the others in the set (he scores 0 on all but one dummy variable in a set). For more information, see D. B. Suits, "Use of Dummy Variables in Regression Equations," Journal of the American Statistical Association, LII (1957), 548-51.

a value of $x_1 = 1$, and a person who did not take the training, $x_1 = 0$. Because b_1 is therefore multiplied by 0 or by 1, the middle term (b_1x_1) is always either 0 or b_1. For a person who did not take training, his wages (y) would be estimated as c + B; if that same person had taken training his wages would be estimated as c + b_1 + B. The effect of MDTA training in the equation, therefore, is to increase estimated wages by an amount equal to b_1 dollars a week. The coefficient (b_1) represents the net effect of training in the regression equation, controlling for all the variables in B.

Of course, since the value of b_1 will be determined from sample data, it is subject to sampling variability. If it were determined from a different sample it might be larger or smaller. For the coefficient (b_1) value to have any meaning it must be accompanied by an indication of its degree of sampling variability, such as its standard error or its 95 per cent confidence limits. Unless the coefficient for training (b_1) is at least three times as large as its standard error, it could easily be the result of sampling variability rather than any real effect of training.[3]

In the multiple regression of weekly wages (for last full-time job after training) on training and the "background" variables, the coefficient for training $(b_1) = -2.20$ with a standard error of 1.83. As the standard error is nearly as big as b_1, the minus sign is probably due to sampling error; the coefficient is not statistically significant. In other words, when controlling for all of the "background" variables at once, no net effect (on wages) from training is evident. The multiple correlation coefficient for training and the "background" variables with "weekly wages on last full-time job since training" is .55, and the proportion of the variance in wages accounted for is therefore .30 (the coefficient squared).[4]

---

[3] For a random sample, the ratio should be at least 1.96 to be statistically significant at the .05 level. The computer program regards the cluster sample used for this study as a random sample in computing standard errors. Therefore, the ratio should be larger.

Since those with relatively high wages in their employment histories are probably most likely to obtain jobs with relatively high wages after training, it might be useful to control for previous earnings. When "weekly wages on last full-time job before training" is added to the list of independent variables in the regression equation, the multiple r increases to .67, indicating that 45 per cent of the variance in wages after training is explained by the variables in the equation. Previous income has much more effect on wages than any other independent variable has. But there is no significant effect due to training in this equation either (the coefficient for training is only .78--too small to be of any importance, even if it were statistically reliable).

Since the "background" variables are all demographic, perhaps the inclusion of some items on attitude or motivation could make a difference in the regression results. While the questionnaire included very few such items, there are two or three on which trainees and "controls" gave different responses. When asked how well they liked their latest jobs, 61 per cent of "completers" and 40 per cent of "controls" said "very well." And when asked about their most important reason for wanting to take job training, more "controls" than "completers" (20 vs. 11 per cent) answered "to get a job that paid more money," while slightly more

---

[4] The regression was done excluding those with no full-time wages reported before training and those never available for a full-time job after training. The results of other regressions indicate that these exclusions made no difference in the basic finding--training has no net effect on wages.

"completers" than "controls" (26 vs. 19 per cent) said "to learn new work skills." When these subjective variables are added to the regression equation, the multiple r is very slightly increased (to .69), but training still has no net effect on wages ($b_1 = -1.16$ with a standard error of 1.64).

Up to this point, the regression equations have compared trainees and non-trainees, without distinguishing between "completers" and "dropouts." But notice that, if training has a small effect on wages, it could be obscured by including "dropouts" who might have attended only one week out of a course lasting 12 weeks or longer. To consider the two types of trainees separately, the regression equation can be written a little differently:

$$y = c + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + B$$

Again, B refers to all the "background" variables and their coefficients, but now x_1 refers to "completers" and x_2 refers to "dropouts." The coefficient b_1 indicates the net effect (on wages) of completing a job training course, compared to non-trainees; b_2 has a similar meaning for taking only part of a training course.

But considering "completers" and "dropouts" separately makes no essential difference in the results. Both b_1 and b_2 are too small in relation to their standard errors to be statistically significant. The same conditions exist when wages before training and the items on attitude and motivation are added to the regression equation. The multiple r values are practically identical to those for the corresponding earlier equations in which all trainees were treated alike.[5]

In other words, when using the regression equations described above, MDTA training had no aggregate effect on wages for those employed full-time after training.

---

[5] The r values, plus b_1 and b_2 and their standard errors, are given in the appendix.

Family Income

Not everyone did find full-time work after training, of course; some worked only part time and others didn't work at all. By using family income instead of wages as the dependent variable it is possible to include more respondents in the analysis. Unfortunately, the number of wage earners in the family is not known, so it must be assumed that trainees and "controls" are not significantly different in average number of workers per family.

By the time the respondents were interviewed, their family incomes had increased considerably. Just before training started, only 48 per cent had incomes of at least $60 a week (Table II.5), but 73 per cent said their incomes were at least that high on the date interviewed (Table III.3). While all four types showed large increases, "controls" improved less than others, reporting somewhat lower incomes. For example, more "completers" than "controls" claimed family incomes of $140 a week or more (28 vs. 20 per cent) and fewer "completers" than "controls" received under $60 a week (22 vs. 34 per cent).

TABLE III.3

FAMILY INCOME WHEN INTERVIEWED, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Weekly Income	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Under $60 . .	22	21	26	34	27
$60 - $99 . .	28	31	18	25	27
$100 - $139 .	22	23	24	21	22
$140 or more .	28	24	32	20	24
Total . . .	100	99	100	100	100
N	(747)	(396)	(127)	(880)	(2,150)

N 2,150
NA 108
Total N . . 2,258

It appears that training might have some effect on family income, unless the introduction of other variables into the analysis can account for the higher incomes of trainees. Again, other potentially relevant variables will all be controlled simultaneously by multiple regression analysis instead of presenting a series of tables in which only one or two other variables are involved. The series of regressions on family income will be similar to what was done for "weekly wages on last full-time job after training." The same equation is used, except that the dependent variable (y) is now family income when interviewed. The same "background" variables as before are represented by B; training is again represented by x_1; and the b_1 coefficient indicates the net effect of training on family income in the equation:

$$y = c + b_1x_1 + B$$

While the multiple r (.46) is not as large as it was for wages, the b_1 coefficient is large enough to suggest that training might well have a net effect on family income ($b_1 = 7.51$, with a standard error of 2.81). The coefficient is large enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level in a random sample, but in the cluster sample used for this study that might not be true.[6]

Adding "family income just before training" as another independent variable in the regression equation results in a higher multiple r (.62) and a slightly larger net effect of training on income ($b_1 = 9.60$, with a standard error of 2.48). Previous income has a far stronger effect than any of the other independent variables, as previous wages did earlier for full-time wages. Since b_1 is 3.87 times as large as its standard error, it is either statistically significant or very nearly so.

---

[6] The 95 per cent confidence limits for b_1 in a random sample would be from 2.00 to 13.02, but in a cluster sample the limits could spread out enough to include zero (if the true standard error is 3.83 or larger). Even if not quite statistically significant, b_1 is still the best available estimate of the net effect of training.

The multiple r is increased very little (to .63) by the inclusion of the attitude and motivation items (how well latest job liked and most important reason for taking training) in the equation. Because one of these added items (how well latest job liked--coefficient of 10.30, with a standard error of 2.49) explains more of the variance in income than training does, the net effect of training is reduced. With a training coefficient of 7.87 and a standard error of 2.51, the net effect of training on family income is estimated as $7.87 a week.[7] That estimate is given with reservations, however, since b_1 is barely three times (3.13) as large as its standard error and might not be statistically significant.

If training actually does affect family income, the net effect should be larger for "completers" than for "dropouts" (the appropriate equation is $y = c + b_1x_2 + b_2x_2 + B$). When the two types of trainees are considered separately, the net effect of training is higher for "completers" ($b_1 = 10.36$, with a standard error of 3.13) than it was for all trainees combined, and there is no net effect for "dropouts" (b_2 is only 1.90, with a standard error of 3.92). When previous income is included in the equation, the net effect of completing MDTA training is increased ($b_1 = 11.84$, with a standard error of 2.76) and the coefficient for "dropouts" is still not statistically significant ($b_2 = 5.19$, with a standard error of 3.46). The addition of the attitude and motivation variables again reduces the net effect of training on family income somewhat. For "completers," the coefficient is 10.08,with a standard error of 2.80. Since b_1 is 3.6 times as large as its standard error, it is either statistically significant or nearly so. Completion of MDTA training, controlling for the other variables in the equation, is estimated to make a difference of $10.08 a week in family income.[8] Again, no net effect is observed for "dropouts" (b_2 = 3.61, with a standard error of 3.47).

---

[7] The 95 per cent confidence limits for b_1 in a random sample would be from $2.95 to $12.79 a week, but if the true standard error for the cluster sample is 4.02 or more, the confidence limits would include zero and b_1 would not be statistically significant. Even then, $7.87 would be the best available estimate, and the probability of the net effect's being zero would be very small.

Aside from previous income, which is the major predictor of income when interviewed, the most important variable in the equation is education. Controlling for all the remaining variables, the income of a high school graduate is estimated to be $16.78 a week higher than that of a high school dropout (standard error is $2.95), $26.89 higher than that of a person who completed eight years of school (standard error is $4.05), and $28.40 higher than that of a person with less than eight years of school (standard error is $4.22). Race is the next most important "background" variable, with a net effect for white persons of $12.79 a week (standard error is $2.69). Main-earner-in-household status and marital status are variables of roughly the same degree of statistical significance as completing MDTA training, with formerly married (widowed, divorced, or separated) persons having smaller family incomes than married or single persons and main-earners reporting less than non-main-earners.

---

[8] The 95 per cent confidence limits in a random sample would be from $4.59 to $15.57 a week, but if the true standard error for the cluster sample is 5.15 or more, the confidence limits would include zero and b_1 would not be statistically significant.

Since, in the aggregate, the regression equations reveal no measurable effect on "weekly wages or last full-time job after training," why does training appear to increase family income? Could part-time jobs or other wage-earners in the family make the difference? Probably not. But a simple and plausible explanation is suggested by the earlier finding that more "completers" (89 per cent) than "controls" (69 per cent) had at least one full-time job after training (Table II.11). The higher family incomes for trainees reflect the fact that more trainees than "controls" had jobs when interviewed, and that among those employed at the time, fewer "controls" had full-time jobs (Table III.4). Less than one-half (45 per cent) of the "controls" were employed full time when interviewed, compared to more than two-thirds (71 per cent) of "completers."

TABLE III.4

FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT WHEN INTERVIEWED, BY RESPONDENT TYPE
(Per Cent)

Employment	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Full-time	71	60	61	45	58
Part-time	7	5	9	10	8
Not employed . .	22	34	30	45	34
Total	100	99	100	100	100
N	(783)	(412)	(135)	(917)	(2,247)

N 2,247
NA 11
Total N 2,258

Any net effect of training on family income, therefore, occurs not because trainees had better jobs but because more of them had jobs. This leads to the tentative conclusion that while MDTA training did not result in higher paying jobs, it did help to increase employment. The effect of training on employment will be examined in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

The task of this chapter is not to show that MDTA training is associated with increased employment--earlier chapters have done that--but to determine the net effect of training on employment when controlling for factors such as education, age, sex, and race. Since high school graduates made up a larger proportion of "completers" (49 per cent) than of "controls" (32 per cent), part of the relationship between training and employment can probably be explained by previous education. If other factors which affect that relationship can be found, the combination of variables might well explain away all, or nearly all, of the effect of training. Multiple regression analysis will again be used to control for several variables simultaneously while examining the association between MDTA training and employment.

Several different measures of employment are available for examination. For example, Table II.11 showed that the proportion who held at least one full-time job since training was higher for "completers" (89 per cent) than for "controls" (69 per cent). And in Table III.4 more "completers" than "controls" were employed full time on the date interviewed (71 *vs.* 45 per cent). Other potential indicators of employment are employment status just after training or twelve months after training. *All* of these variables are simple dichotomies, of course; at a particular time a person is either employed or not employed. It would be possible to make three categories by distinguishing between full-time and part-time jobs, but the resulting measure would be fairly crude and would still depend on the particular date chosen for analysis.

By summarizing employment histories, it is possible to develop simple scales which show each person's employment standing in relation to all other persons in the sample population. Two such scales were constructed, based on the number of months for a selected type of activity during the year just after training (with a range from 0 to 12), and the per cent of months between training and the date of the interview (with a range from 0 to 100).[1] Each scale was used for two variables--unemployment and full-time employment--resulting in four dependent variables for the analysis of employment: (1) number of months unemployed during the year just after training, (2) per cent of months unemployed between training and date of interview, (3) number of months employed full time during the year just after training, and (4) per cent of months employed full time between training and date of interview.[2] The analysis will concentrate on the last of these four dependent variables, but findings for the other three will also be reported.

Effects of Training and Background

As expected, MDTA training is related to the amount of full-time employment. More trainees than non-trainees were employed full time the entire period since training (33 vs. 12 per cent), and fewer trainees than non-trainees held full-time jobs for only 20 per cent or less of the same period (19 vs. 42 per cent). From the tabulations by respondent type (Table IV.1), it can be seen that the median "completer" was employed full time more than 80 per cent of the months after training, while the median "control" worked full time less than 40 per cent.

---

[1] On each scale, certain people were classified as not applicable. On the number of months during the year just after training, a person is not applicable if he had any period of unknown activity or of military service during that year. On the per cent of months between training and interview, a person is not applicable if periods of known activity other than military service added up to less than twelve months.

[2] Unemployment is not merely anything except working part time or full time. If a person was going to school or taking a job training course, he was not considered as unemployed at that time.

TABLE IV.1

PER CENT OF MONTHS EMPLOYED FULL TIME BETWEEN TRAINING AND DATE OF INTERVIEW, BY RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Months of Full-time Employment (Per Cent)	Respondent Type				
	Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
0 . . .	11	15	17	31	20
1-20 . . .	6	8	8	13	10
21-40 . . .	8	7	6	13	10
41-60 . . .	9	7	12	8	9
61-80 . . .	13	14	13	15	14
81-99 . . .	18	16	17	10	14
100	34	32	28	10	23
Total. .	99	99	101	100	100
N. . . .	(728)	(397)	(133)	(913)	(2171)

N.	2,171
Not Applicable .	87
Total N . .	2,258

Considering the sexes separately, Table IV.2 shows that for both men and women, "completers" had more full-time work since training than "controls." Among men, more "completers" than "controls" worked full time over 80 per cent of the months after training (60 vs. 28 per cent) and fewer "completers" held full-time jobs only 20 per cent or less of the same period (13 vs. 34 per cent). Among women, findings were in the same direction (corresponding comparisons are 41 vs. 6 per cent and 23 vs. 61 per cent). "Dropouts" and "didn't enrolls" had amounts of full-time employment similar to "completers" for men, but for women they occupied a position between "completers" and "controls." In each respondent type, men had more full-time employment than did women, but women "completers" exceeded men "controls."

TABLE IV.2

PER CENT OF MONTHS EMPLOYED FULL TIME BETWEEN TRAINING AND DATE OF INTERVIEW, BY SEX AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Sex	Months of Full-time Employment (Per Cent)	Respondent Type				
		Completers	Dropouts	Didn't Enrolls	Controls	Total
Male	0- 20 . .	13	15	16	34	22
	21- 80 . .	27	27	24	38	31
	81-100 . .	60	59	60	28	47
	Total	100	101	100	100	100
	N . .	(409)	(289)	(80)	(561)	(1,339)
Female	0- 20 . .	23	47	38	61	43
	21- 80 . .	36	33	42	33	35
	81-100 . .	41	19	21	6	22
	Total	100	99	101	100	100
	N . .	(319)	(108)	(53)	(352)	(832)

N	2,171
Not applicable	87
Total N	2,258

Sex is only one of several characteristics which might affect the relationship between training and employment. Education, race, age, and other variables will also be controlled in the multiple regression analyses. As in the chapter on income, the regression equation is: $y = a + b_1x_1 + B$.

The dependent variable (y) is "per cent of months employed full time between training and date of interview;" x_1 is the training variable ($x_1 = 1$ for a trainee, and $x_1 = 0$ for a non-trainee); the coefficient (b_1) indicates the net effect of training on y when controlling for B; B includes the "background" variables (listed in Table III.2) and their coefficients ($b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + \ldots + b_nx_n$).

Regression Number 1: Background Variables (B)

This first multiple regression for full-time employment resulted in a multiple correlation coefficient (r) of .53--with 28 per cent of the variance (r^2) accounted for by training and the "background" variables. The value of b_1 is 20, indicating that in this equation the estimated net effect of MDTA training is to increase full-time employment by 20 per cent of the period between training and the interview. Since the mean for full-time employment is 55 per cent of the months after training, a net effect of 20 per cent represents over one-third of the mean. A person who would otherwise have a full-time job 55 per cent of the time since training would be estimated to increase that to 75 per cent by MDTA training.[3]

---

[3] There is no doubt about the statistical significance of b_1, because its standard error is only 1.5 when treating the data as a random sample. The ratio of b_1 to its standard error is 13.2--well above the 1.96 criterion for

How does MDTA training compare to the "background" variables in net effect on full-time employment? Training is estimated to have the strongest effect of all 21 variables in Table IV.3 (The 10 "background" variables are expanded to 20 by the dummy variable method described in the previous chapter.) It has both the largest coefficient and the largest ratio of coefficient to standard error (and therefore the highest level of statistical significance). Of all the independent variables in the equation, training is the one least correlated with the others (multiple r = .20), which supports the earlier finding, discussed in Chapter II, that trainees and non-trainees were generally similar on background characteristics.

With a coefficient-to-standard-error ratio of 9.9, sex is the variable with the next highest level of statistical significance. When all other variables in the equation are controlled, men are estimated to exceed women in full-time employment by 18.1 per cent of the number of months after training--a net effect nearly as large as for training.

Education is another important variable, with persons who never completed eighth grade estimated to have less full-time employment after training than high school graduates (the omitted category) by 18.4 per cent of that period, which amounts to about one-third of the mean employment level. For persons with eight years of school completed the coefficient is 8.9, and for those who dropped out of high school it is 6.5; both of these have a smaller, but statistically significant, ratio of coefficient to standard error (3.6).

---

significance in a random sample at the .05 level, and well above the approximate criterion of 3.0 for the cluster sample in this study. The 95 per cent confidence limits for b_1 in a random sample would be from 17.2 to 23.1, and for this cluster sample might be roughly from 15 to 25.

TABLE IV.3

RESULTS FROM FIRST MULTIPLE REGRESSION FOR PER CENT OF MONTHS EMPLOYED FULL TIME AFTER TRAINING

Variable	Coefficient (Net Effect in Per Cent of Months)	Ratio of Coefficient to Standard Error
MDTA trainee--yes	20.1	13.2
Sex--male	18.1	9.9
Education--under 8 years	-18.4	7.1
--8 years	- 8.9	3.6
--9 to 11 years	- 6.5	3.6
Age--under 20 years	10.7	3.3
--20 to 29 years	12.8	4.8
--30 to 39 years	8.0	2.7
--40 to 49 years	6.2	2.2
Race--white	10.3	6.3
Unemployment in year before training		
--0 months	12.8	6.0
--1 to 3 months	14.4	7.4
--4 to 11 months	6.8	3.7
Main earner of household--yes	10.7	5.8
Geographic region--South	- 6.4	2.4
Marital status--married now	.3	.1
--never married	.2	.1
Number of unmarried children under 18 years old--0	- .1	.0
--1	4.9	1.9
--2	1.7	.6
Per capita annual income of state (index)	- .4	.8

The four coefficients for age indicate that each of the age groups listed is estimated to have more full-time employment than the oldest (and omitted) category of 50 years or older when controlling for the other independent variables. The effect of age on employment is not quite linear, however, because the largest net effect is estimated for the 20-29 years group (12.8 per cent) rather than for teen-agers (10.7 per cent). Some of the age categories have coefficient-to-standard-error ratios small enough to question the statistical significance of their coefficients.

Race and main-earner status are variable, having roughly the same amount of net effect on full-time employment. Both are statistically significant, with coefficients about six times as large as their standard errors. The net effect of being white is estimated as 10.3 per cent of the months since training, and the effect of being the main earner of one's household is estimated as 10.7 per cent.

Like age, previous unemployment is not quite linear in its effect on full-time employment. The net effect of having one to three months of unemployment (rather than twelve months--the omitted category) is slightly larger (14.4 per cent) than for zero months (12.8 per cent). For four to eleven months, the net effect is smaller (6.8 per cent), and the ratio of b_1 to its standard error (3.7) is also smaller, though still significant. In other words, persons who were unemployed the entire year just before training were less likely than others to be working full time after training even when controlling for all the other independent variables in the equation.

Other things being equal, a person living in the South is estimated to have less full-time employment ($b_1 = -6.4$), but while the coefficient would be statistically significant in a random sample, the ratio to its standard error is small enough (2.4) that in this cluster sample the coefficient is probably not quite significant. Even so, there probably is a small net effect on employment from living in the South.

Each of the remaining variables in Table IV.3 failed to have a statistically significant net effect on full-time employment. Therefore, marital status, number of children, and state per capita income could be eliminated from the regression equation without materially affecting the findings.

Though the last few turned out to be unimportant, most of the "background" variables do have some effect on unemployment. For some, the effects are as large as one-third of the mean level of full-time employment. Yet even when controlling for all of the "background" variables, MDTA training is found to have more effect on employment than any of the other variables in the regression equation. But the equation does not provide a completely accurate understanding; other factors must also be considered.

Controlling Additional Variables

The major item to be added to the analysis is a control for the fact that different definitions of the period "after training" are involved. For non-trainees, what does "after training" mean?

When comparing "controls" with trainees, the most sensible definition of the period after training might be a period identical to that for the corresponding trainee. In other words, if a trainee left his MDTA course at the end of August, 1964, then the period "after training" would begin with September, 1964, for both the trainee and the corresponding control group person. But the resulting periods "after training" would not be as equal for the trainee and corresponding "control" as one might suppose. The reason lies in the criteria for selection of a control group respondent, one of which is that he must have been unemployed "about" the time the corresponding trainee began his MDTA course--"about" meaning within three months before or after that date. Since many of the trainees left their courses in less than three months (three months was the mean length of training for "dropouts"), it is possible that in some cases the period of unemployment which qualified a person as a control group respondent did not begin until after the corresponding trainee had left his MDTA course. For many other "controls," unemployment would have begun only shortly before their corresponding trainees left training and would have lasted well beyond that date. Inescapably, therefore, such control group respondents would have some unemployment in the early months of their period "after training." This would result in a biased comparison which attributes to training a greater effect on employment than is realistic.

For those non-trainees who were referred to some MDTA training course but did not actually enroll in the course ("didn't enrolls"), there is no corresponding trainee whose date of leaving training could be used in a definition of the period "after training." Since the definition suggested above cannot be used for "didn't enrolls" and results in biased findings for comparisons of trainees and "controls," it was not used.

Instead, the period "after training" was defined to include all activities listed in the recent employment history table of the questionnaires (Question 34 of the "Main Sample Questionnaire," and Question 13 of the "Control Group Questionnaire"), which really means three different definitions: (1) For trainees, including both "completers" and "dropouts," the period "after training" began right after they left MDTA training. (2) For a "didn't enroll," it began right after the starting date of the MDTA course to which he had been referred. (3) For a "control," it began right after the starting date of MDTA training for the corresponding trainee.

With this understanding of "the period after training," it is obvious that a large proportion of non-trainees would necessarily be unemployed at the beginning of the period. The comparison between trainees and "controls" is considerably more biased than with the definition suggested earlier: a trainee has the advantage of being able to look for a job while taking an MDTA course without being classified as unemployed during that time, but the corresponding "control" has no such interlude between his periods "before training" and "after training." Therefore, an analysis of the effect of training on employment must allow for the fact that the period "after training" is defined so as to prevent most members of the control group from beginning the period as employees.

Regression Number 2: B + Full-time Employment (Just after Training)

The addition of a dummy variable for employment-status-just-after-training to the previous regression equation serves as a control for the advantage given to trainees by the definition of the period after training. In the second regression equation, then, another term, $b_f F$, is added to the series of independent variables and their coefficients:

$$y = a + b_1 x_1 + b_f F + B$$

The new dummy variable, F, has a value of 1 if a person was employed full time just after training and 0 if he was not. The coefficient, b_f, is the net effect on y of being employed full time just after training.

Of course, the MDTA program attempted to make job placements immediately after training. Part of the effect of training is, therefore, hidden in the added term of the equation. In other words, this method of controlling for the unfair advantage trainees had in Regression Number 1 is actually too severe; whatever the net effect of training in Regression Number 2, the true value should be somewhat larger--somewhere between the results from these first two regressions.

Regression Number 2 produces a multiple correlation of .70, thus accounting for about one-half of the variance in amount of full-time employment after training.[4] Employment status just after training has the largest estimated net effect (40 per cent), as might be expected. The estimated net effect of MDTA training is reduced to 9 per cent (from 20 per cent in Regression Number 1), which is still statistically significant (the ratio of coefficient to standard error is 6.8). Since this equation is an over-correction of the previous one, the true value for the estimated net effect of training on per cent of months employed full time after training is somewhere between 9 and 20 per cent when controlling for the "background" variables.

Regression Number 3: B + Full-time + Motivation + Attitude

The addition of available motivation and attitude variables to the equation has no appreciable effect. The equation for Regression Number 3 is the same as for Regression Number 2 except for the addition of three dummy variables: (1) The most important reason for taking job training is to learn new skills. (2) The most important reason for taking job-training is to get a job with more money. (3) Latest job was liked very well. But again, $r = .70$ and the net effect of training is estimated to be 9 per cent. These three added variables are the only subjective items on which "completers" and "controls" differed enough to suggest their inclusion in the analysis. Since they make no essential difference in the net effect of training, these subjective variables will not be included in subsequent regressions--even though one of them (latest job liked very well) has an estimated net effect on full-time employment of 6 per cent (the coefficient-to-standard-error ratio is 4.7, which is statistically significant).

---

[4] The correlation is considerably higher than for the first regression (.53), but understandably so, because the newly added independent variable--employment status just after training--is in a way a part of the dependent variable. Therefore, regression equations including a control for first activity after training produce artificially high multiple correlations.

Regression Number 4: B + Employed (Just after Training)

This regression is like Number 2, except that employment (including part-time) just after training, instead of full-time employment, is used to control for the effects of different definitions of the period after training. This regression is primarily for different dependent variables (months of unemployment in the year after training, and per cent of months of unemployment between training and date of interview), but was also run for per cent of months employed full time after training. The resulting multiple correlation is .61, and the net effect of training is estimated at 14 per cent.

Regression Number 5: Short B

In the discussion of Regression Number 1 it was pointed out that the last "background" variables listed in Table IV.3--marital status, number of unmarried children under 18 years old, and state per capita income--could be eliminated from the regression without materially changing the results. Regression Number 5 does just that. As in Regression Number 1, the multiple correlation coefficient is .53, and the net effect of MDTA training is estimated to be 20 per cent. Since there is practically no difference when those insignificant variables are eliminated, they will not be included in Regressions 6 through 11. Instead of B (the ten "background" variables listed in Table III.2), these regressions will have Short B in the regression equation to represent the shorter list of seven "background" variables.

Regression Number 6: Short B, Excluding "Didn't Enrolls"

Up to this point trainees have been compared to all non-trainees in the regression equations. But there are two respondent types included in non-trainees--"didn't enrolls" and "controls." Since both types were unemployed about the same time as the trainees they can both be considered together as a control group. But "didn't enrolls" are a special group which might well be biased in one way or another. How much difference might it make if the "didn't enrolls" were excluded from the regression analysis?

Regression Number 6 is the same as Number 5 except that all non-trainees are "controls"--the "didn't enrolls" are excluded. The multiple correlation is very slightly higher (.54 instead of .53), and the estimated not effect of training is also slightly larger (22 instead of 20 per cent). These differences are small enough that it is not necessary to exclude "didn't enrolls" from Regressions 7 through 11.

Regression Number 7: Short B, Excluding Not Available for Job

Not all persons in the sample were looking for full-time jobs after training. Persons who were not available for work--for health, family, or other reasons--might well be excluded from the analysis. Since the proportion (of those not working full-time when interviewed) who said they had not been available for full-time employment was greater for "completers" (23 per cent) than for "controls" (13 per cent), if such persons are excluded from the regression the net effect of training should be somewhat larger than before.

The estimated net effect of training is increased only slightly (from 20 to 22 per cent) in Regression Number 7 by excluding persons never available for a full-time job from the Number 5 equation. The multiple correlation remains .53.

Regression Number 8: Short B + Full-Time, Excluding Not Available

When the dummy variable for full-time employment just after training is added to the equation (as in Regression Number 2) and persons not available for work are excluded, the net effect of training is estimated to be 11 per cent. This result from Regression Number 8 is slightly higher than the 9 per cent from Regression Number 2. Since this equation represents an over-correction (as in Number 2), the true value for the net effect of training is estimated to be between the 11 and 22 per cent estimates from Regressions 8 and 7.

Regression Number 10: Short B, Excluding Not Working Full-Time[5]

Another way to control for the effects of different definitions of the period after training is to divide the sample into two groups and run separate regressions on them. Regression Number 10 is like Number 7 except that it includes only persons whose first activity after training was a full-time job. Again, some of the effect of training is hidden if it was partly responsible for getting post-training jobs; to such an extent this regression is an over-correction and the estimated net effect of training is too low. The multiple correlation for this regression is only .28, and the net effect of training is estimated at 6 per cent (which might or might not be statistically significant--the ratio of coefficient to standard error is (3.1). Since the mean level of full-time employment is 85 per cent of the months since training for persons working full time just after training, the 6 per cent net effect estimated for training is not large enough to be important.

---

[5] Regression Number 9 is for different dependent variables (unemployment instead of full-time employment), but is included in the number sequence to keep the regression numbers the same as for the summary tables in the appendix. It is similar to Number 4, except that persons not available for work are excluded (and Short B is used instead of B).

Regression Number 11: Short B, Excluding Working Full Time

This regression equation is also like Number 7, but only persons who were not employed full time just after training are included (those not available for full-time jobs are excluded in addition to these working full time just after training). The multiple correlation coefficient is .47, and the net effect estimated for training is 14 per cent, which is more than one-third of the mean level of full-time employment (37 per cent of the months after training) for those not working full time just after training. This sizable effect estimated for training is statistically significant; the coefficient-to-standard-error ratio is 7.1.

What is the essential conclusion reached about training from this series of regressions? While the 22 per cent net effect estimated for training in Regression Number 7 is too high because different definitions of the period "after training" are used for trainees and non-trainees, the 11 per cent in Regression Number 8 is too low because of an over-correction for the difference in definitions. Therefore, while it is not possible to name a specific percentage, the net effect of MDTA training on amount of full-time employment is estimated to be between 11 and 22 per cent of the months between training and interview date, when controlling for the "background" variables (and the motiviation and attitude variables used in Regression Number 3), compared to a mean of 57 per cent. For persons with 18 months between training and interview, for example, the net effect would be estimated at between 2 and 4 months of full-time employment, compared to a mean level of about 10 months of full-time employment.

Effects of Course Completion

If MDTA training really has an effect on employment, then that effect should be greater for those who completed training courses than for those who dropped out. The previous regressions for full-time employment considered all trainees together, without distinguishing between "completers" and "dropouts." The same series of regressions was repeated using two dummy variables for MDTA training instead of one, thereby obtaining separate estimates of the net effect of training for "completers" and for "dropouts." The multiple correlation coefficients in this new series of regressions are practically identical to the previous series.

As expected, the estimated net effect of training is greater for "completers" than for "dropouts" in each regression; in Table IV.4 the average difference is about 6 per cent of the months after training. Some of the coefficients for "dropouts" may not be statistically significant (coefficient-to-standard-error ratios are less than 3 for some regressions), but the effects for "completers" are of about the same level of significance as for all trainees combined in the previous series of regressions. Using Regressions 7 and 8 again to establish the range, the net effect of full-time employment is estimated at between 13 and 23 per cent of the months after training for "completers" and between 7 and 19 per cent for "dropouts."

TABLE IV.4

NET EFFECTS OF MDTA TRAINING ON PER CENT OF MONTHS EMPLOYED FULL TIME AFTER TRAINING, IN A SERIES OF MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS

Regression Number[a]	Coefficient for Training (Net Effect in Per Cent)			Ratio of Coefficient to Standard Error		
	All Trainees Combined	Completers	Dropouts	All Trainees Combined	Completers	Dropouts
1A, B	20	22	16	13.2	13.1	7.5
2A, B	9	12	5	6.8	7.8	2.5
3A, B	9	11	4	6.3	7.3	2.1
4A, B	14	17	10	9.9	10.2	5.1
5A, B	20	22	16	13.3	13.1	7.6
6A, B	22	25	18	14.4	14.2	8.5
7A, B	22	23	19	14.0	13.4	8.6
8A, B	11	13	7	7.9	8.4	3.7
10A, B	6	6	5	3.2	3.1	2.3
11A, B	14	17	7	7.1	7.7	2.3

[a] For each regression, the independent variables involved are described earlier in this chapter; A and B differ only in that A considered all trainees combined and B separated effects of training for "completers" and for "dropouts."

When the same independent variables are used in a similar series of regressions for "the number of months employed full time in the year just after training," the estimated net effects of training are slightly larger than for the entire period after training. For "completers" the net effect of training is estimated at between 1.8 and 3.2 months out of the year, compared to a mean full-time employment level of 6.6 months. Converting those net effects to percentages, the range is from 15 to 27 per cent of the year. For "dropouts" the estimated range is 1.0 to 2.6 months (or 8 to 22 per cent); for all trainees combined it is 1.5 to 3.0 months (or 13 to 25 per cent).

A corresponding series of regressions for unemployment produces roughly similar results. The net effects of training are estimated to be slightly smaller on unemployment than on full-time employment, with the differences being a little larger for the entire period after training than during the year just after training. Regression Number 9 is used (instead of Number 8) with Number 7 to establish the range for the estimates. For the entire period, the net effect of training is estimated to reduce unemployment between 10 and 17 per cent of the months after training, compared to a mean unemployment level of 32 per cent. For "completers" the range is 12 to 19 per cent, and for "dropouts" it is 5 to 13 per cent. During the year just after training, the net effect of training is estimated to reduce unemployment between 1.5 and 2.7 months (13 and 23 per cent), compared to a mean unemployment level of 4.5 months. For "completers" the range is 1.8 to 2.9 months (15 to 24 per cent), and for "dropouts" it is 1.0 to 2.2 months (8 to 18 per cent).

For each of the four dependent variables, then, MDTA training is estimated to have a larger net effect on employment for those who completed their courses than for those who did not, though even the latter receive a statistically significant improvement in employment , controlling for several "background" variables. Detailed summary tables in the appendix provide results of 72 separate regressions, including 108 coefficients representing the net effects of training discussed in this chapter plus others in the series of regressions for these four dependent variables.

Length and Type of Training

Since MDTA training apparently increases employment, does it follow that more MDTA training will lead to more employment for an individual? That is, if a person takes a six-month training course, is he more likely to find steadier employment than if he takes a six-week course? Or if he fails to complete a six-month course, will he gain measurably more if he stays for four months rather than two months?

Tentative "yes" answers to these questions are suggested by Table IV.5, which shows that the proportion employed full time over 80 per cent of the period after training was a little higher for those who had at least three months of MDTA training (54 per cent) than for those with shorter training experiences (46 per cent). Even though far more "completers" than "dropouts" had at least three months of training (69 vs.39 per cent), the employment advantage for those with longer training is not explained away by that relationship. In fact, the advantage appears at least as great among "dropouts" as among "completers;" the proportion employed full time over 80 per cent of the period since training was a little higher for those with

TABLE IV.5

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT SINCE TRAINING, BY LENGTH OF TRAINING AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent)

Respondent Type	Months of Training	Months Employed Full-time Since Training				
		0-20%	21-80%	81-100%	Total	N
Completers	0 - 2.9 . .	22	30	48	100	(228)
	3.0 or more .	15	31	54	100	(500)
Dropouts	0 - 2.9 . .	24	32	45	101	(238)
	3.0 or more .	22	24	53	99	(152)
Total	0 - 2.9 . .	23	31	46	100	(466)
	3.0 or more .	17	30	54	101	(652)

N	1,118
NA or not applicable[a]	1,140
Total N	2,258

---

[a] Most (1,061) are non-trainees, 71 had fewer than 12 months of known activity other than military service since training, and 8 are NA on length of training.

at least three months of training in both groups (54 vs. 48 per cent among "completers," and 53 vs. 45 per cent among "dropouts"). The data in Table IV.5 indicate a stronger effect on full-time employment from the length of training than from course completion, without controlling for any other variables.

This relationship between length of training and full-time employment appears even though three complications in the length-of-training variable tend to reduce its effect. First, a longer training course does not necessarily mean that the class does more advanced work; some classes have students with poorer educational backgrounds, who need to spend more time on basic education and thus have less time to learn specific job skills. Second, because some courses are much longer than others, it is possible that one "dropout" may have completed 90 per cent of his course in 9 weeks, while another may have had 12 weeks of training and have completed less than 50 per cent of his course; controlling for the proportion of the course completed would avoid that problem, but the available data do not permit such a control in this study (the course length is unknown for a majority of "dropouts"). Third, depending on the area job market and on the previous experience and education of the trainees in a given area, it probably takes considerably less training to become employable in some occupations than in others. This last complication can be partially handled by considering type of training.

The MDTA courses in which sample trainees participated were classified by a numerical code from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Second Edition, 1949) and then grouped into eight occupational types for analysis. While the categories are broad and include a variety of occupations, they are

TABLE IV.6

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT SINCE TRAINING, BY TYPE OF TRAINING AND RESPONDENT TYPE

(Per Cent Employed Over 80 Per Cent of the Months Since Training)

Type of Training	Respondent Type		
	Completers	Dropouts	Total
Professional, technical, managerial	* (29)	* (15)	66 (44)
Clerical.	44 (159)	29 (63)	40 (222)
Service	38 (102)	26 (38)	35 (140)
Skilled	65 (199)	64 (142)	65 (341)
Semi-skilled.	54 (184)	53 (93)	54 (277)
Other[a].	31 (49)	* (9)	29 (58)

N.	1,082
NA (not applicable)[b] .	1,176
Total N	2,258

---

*Percentage not given because base N is too small for reliability (minimum of 30 arbitrarily chosen).

[a] "Other" includes three groups with small base N values: sales (31), agriculture (21), and unskilled (6).

[b] Most (1,061) are non-trainees; 69 had fewer than 12 months of known activity other than military service since training; and 46 are NA on type of training.

also distinctive enough to permit some differences in employment levels, as shown in Table IV.6. The proportions employed over 80 per cent of the period after training were highest for professional, technical or managerial occupations (66 per cent) and skilled workers (65 per cent), followed by semi-skilled workers (54 per cent). Considerably lower proportions were achieved by clerical (40 per cent), service (35 per cent), and "other"--sales, agriculture, and unskilled (29 per cent).

Those trained in skilled occupations reported high employment even though they had the highest proportion of "dropouts" (42 per cent). In skilled and in semi-skilled occupations, "dropouts" and "completers" achieved similar employment levels; in clerical and in service occupations, "completers" made better employment records than "dropouts." Within each respondent type, the types of training have the same rank order on employment in Table IV.6.

These employment differences for occupational types occurred despite deficiencies in the classification of training courses which tend to reduce differences among types. A broad range of job complexity exists within each training type; for example, a file clerk, a stenographer, and a secretary would all be considered clerical. Many of the MDTA courses could have been classified as either semi-skilled or skilled, and some were undoubtedly put into the wrong category. Consider, for example, different courses for combination welders lasting 12 weeks in Indiana and 52 weeks in California--or Los Angeles area courses for general machine operators ranging from 8 to 40 weeks. No information was available to indicate whether these courses achieved different skill levels or started with students of different backgrounds and achieved similar skill levels.

The two occupational categories with the best employment records--professional, technical, managerial and skilled--are also the two with the longest training courses. The mean length of training for "completers" is over 200 days for each of those two types of training in Table IV.7. Service occupations, which have the least amount of employment in Table IV.6 (except for the residual "other" category), are also the shortest courses--a mean length of 99 days in Table IV.7 (sales courses are shorter, with only 53 days, but the employment level is not known because they are in the residual "other" category in Table IV.6). The rank order of occupations is not quite identical for employment and for length of training; semi-skilled has more employment and shorter training than clerical (among "completers"). But length and type of training do appear to be somewhat related to each other (and to employment). In three multiple regressions for length of training on type of training, the multiple correlation coefficients are .32 for all trainees, .44 for "completers" only, and .24 for "dropouts" only.[6]

How strong are the relationships between length of training and employment (Table IV.5), and between type of training and employment (Table IV.6)? Completion of training is more important than either length or type. When controlling for completion and the "background" variables, neither length nor type of training has a net effect on employment which is statistically significant (type of training comes closer than length, but it would not be

---

[6] Excluded from those regressions are persons NA on length of training, with less than 12 months of known activity other than military service since training, or not available for full-time job since training.

TABLE IV.7

MEAN LENGTH OF TRAINING, BY TYPE OF TRAINING AND RESPONDENT TYPE[a]

Type of Training	Respondent Type			
	Completers		Dropouts	
	Mean Length of Training (Days)	N	Mean Length of Training (Days)	N
Professional, technical, managerial .	256	(20)	178	(10)
Clerical . .	161	(123)	82	(36)
Sales	53	(15)	*	(1)
Service . . .	99	(85)	67	(27)
Agriculture .	162	(14)	*	(4)
Skilled . . .	201	(190)	94	(124)
Semi-skilled	131	(168)	85	(84)
Unskilled . .	*	(1)	*	(2)

*Mean not listed because base N is too small for reliability (minimum of 10 arbitrarily chosen).

[a] Not all trainees are included in this table: 168 "completers" and 125 "dropouts" are excluded because NA on type of training, NA on length of training, less than 12 months of known activity other than military service since training, or not available for a full-time job since training.

significant in a random sample: F = 2.86 with 912 degrees of freedom).[7] When length of training, type of training, completion of training, and "background" variables (Short B) are all in the regression equation, the net effect of completion on full-time employment is estimated as 6 per cent of the months since training--that is, "completers" are estimated to have more full-time employment than "dropouts" by 6 per cent of the period after training. But that net effect might not be statistically significant, though

---

[7] In a random sample, F = 3.84 would be significant at the .05 level. The F values used to test the significance of the net effect of a Factor A is determined by the following formula:

$$F = \frac{(R_a^2 - R_b^2)\ (n - k_1 - k_2 - 1)}{(1 - R_a^2)\ (k_1)}$$

in which: R_a = multiple correlation coefficient of regression equation which includes Factor A and other independent variables (Short B and completion)

R_b = multiple correlation coefficient of similar regression equation without Factor A

n = number of persons for which observations are used

k_1 = number of dummy variables representing Factor A in regression equation (7 for type of training)

k_2 = number of other independent variables (15 for Short B and completion)

(Emanuel Melichar. "Least-Squares Analysis of Economic Survey Data," American Statistical Association Proceedings, Business and Economics Section, 1965, p. 381.) For type of training, R_a = .435, R_b = .414, and n = 935 (excluding non-trainees, persons not available for full-time work since training, persons with less than 12 months of known activity other than military service, or NA on length of training). The dependent variable in the regression equations is per cent of months employed full time since training.

it would be so in a random sample (the coefficient-to-standard-error ratio is 2.3). In this regression equation, which is limited to MDTA trainees, race and education are the most important independent variables.[8]

Since length of training and type of training each fail to demonstrate a significant net effect on employment among trainees, and since the net effect of completion may or may not be statistically significant, it is mathematically possible that it really makes no difference how much training or what kind of training one takes. But since those who take at least some training are estimated to have significantly more employment, this would suggest that it is not the training which makes a difference in employment but some other factor not included in the analyses of the study. The same factor which predisposes certain people to take MDTA training could also be completely responsible for their increased employment, relative to non-trainees. This is conjecture about an unlikely possibility, of course. Even though type and length of training failed to achieve statistical significance, the probability that they have some positive effect on employment is greater than the probability that they have none. And if it were not for certain deficiencies in those variables (as described previously), statistical significance might have been achieved, or at least approached.[9]

---

[8] The net effect on full-time employment of being white is estimated as 14 per cent of the months after training (coefficient/standard error = 5.8). Compared to high school graduates, the net loss for having only 0-7 years of school is estimated as 15 per cent (error ratio = 3.8), for 8 years it is 14 per cent (ratio = 3.6), and for 9-11 years it is 9 per cent (ratio = 3.4).

[9] Statistical significance is difficult to achieve partly because non-trainees are excluded from the analyses of length and type of training, reducing the number of observations. In a larger sample these variables might well have significant effects on employment.

But the relatively weak relationships of type and length of training to employment do raise some doubts about how much difference training makes. Even if statistically significant, a net effect of 6 per cent (of the period since training) for "completers" in comparison with "dropouts" is not large--only one month out of 17. Therefore, it should be remembered that the estimates of net effects of MDTA training on full-time employment are derived from a model with only certain variables included. Likely candidates for other variables to study are motivation and intelligence. It seems plausible that the persons who want jobs the most and those who have the best mental abilities might be most likely both to find jobs and to make use of various means of obtaining employment, including MDTA courses. The addition of these or other factors to the multiple regression equation might well reduce the 13 to 23 per cent net effect of training estimated for "completers" and the 7 to 19 per cent estimated for "dropouts." Unless and until such unknown factors are identified, however, these are the best available estimates of the effects of MDTA training on full-time employment.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

While some graduates of MDTA job training courses refer to their instruction as "fabulous" and claim that it actually prepared them for good jobs, other participants say that they were not taught anything useful and call it "a waste of time." No doubt some courses were much better than others, and in the same course some students gained much more than others. This study is a nationwide evaluation of the institutional--in contrast to on-the-job--training courses of the MDTA program, from the perspective of the students. About 1,200 former MDTA trainees (from 49 sample areas) were interviewed early in 1966--over a year after their job training--to learn their opinions of the program and what their subsequent employment experiences were like. What, if anything, had they learned in their courses? What did they like or dislike about them? Did they believe that their training helped them to get jobs?

The basic purpose of the study is to learn what effects MDTA training courses had on income and employment for at least a year after the courses ended. Did the former trainees reach higher income levels and experience less unemployment than they would have without taking job training courses? If so, by how much?

Method

A simple comparison of the trainees' economic situations before and after training cannot measure the effects of the MDTA program, because changes could be partly or entirely due to other factors. Since unemployment in the United States was decreasing from 1963 to 1966, the trainees would be expected to have improved their economic situations during that period even if they had received no job training. Therefore, comparisons should be made with a control group of similar people who were unemployed about the same time as the trainees, but who did not participate in the MDTA program.

A partial matching process ("snowball" sample) was used to obtain a control group at least roughly similar to the sample of trainees. Each trainee interviewed was asked to provide the names and addresses of up to three friends, neighbors, or relatives who were unemployed about the time his training course started--only one of whom would be interviewed as a control group person. If no eligible control group respondent could be obtained by the personal referral process, the interviewer began canvassing in the block where the trainee lived looking for a person who was unemployed about the time the trainee's course started. If possible, the control group respondent was of the same sex as the trainee when either procedure was used. As neighbors or acquaintances of the trainees, control group persons were often similar to the trainees in various other ways, too. Because control group persons were only partially matched to the corresponding trainees, some differences between the two groups could easily occur. Therefore, the effects of such differences were controlled for when investigating the relationships between training and income or employment.

A total of 925 partially-matched control group persons were interviewed--585 after personal referrals, and 340 after canvassing. Another small group of non-trainees were interviewed as a special type of control group--136 persons who had been referred to MDTA courses but who failed to enroll and participate in the training. Since there are 1,197 trainees in the sample (784 "completers" and 413 "dropouts"), a grand total of 2,258 persons were interviewed.

Trained interviewers filled out detailed questionnaires during structured interviews. Retrospective questions were asked to obtain information about the periods before and after the MDTA training, with employment histories covering the period from September, 1961, to the interview date in early 1966. Most of the analysis deals with fairly recent data, in order to avoid errors of memory for information dating back to 1961 or 1962.

Comparisons before Training

Trainees and "controls" (the partially-matched control group persons) have generally similar background characteristics. Because sex was involved in the control group selection process, the proportion of men for "controls" (62 per cent) is practically the same as for trainees (63 per cent). Among trainees, however, more "dropouts" than "completers" are men (73 vs. 58 per cent). The different respondent types all have similar racial distributions--between 60 and 63 per cent white (practically all non-whites are Negro). More men than women in the grand total (trainees plus non-trainees) are white (69 vs. 49 per cent). Age distributions are not very different for trainees and "controls," though trainees have a somewhat larger proportion in the 20 to 29 year age group (39 vs. 29 per cent). A majority (55 per cent) of the grand total was under 30 years of age when training started, including 20 per cent under 20 years. In each respondent type, men are older than women.

Education is the background characteristic on which trainees and "controls" differ most, with "completers" having considerally more high school graduates than "controls" (49 vs. 32 per cent). In the grand total, more women than men are high school graduates (50 vs. 32 per cent). At the time training started, each respondent type had a marital status distribution similar to the grand total: 59 per cent married, 27 per cent never married, and 14 per cent formerly married (divorced, widowed, or separated). Trainees and "controls" did not differ greatly from the grand total on either the proportion who were household heads (49 per cent) or the proportion who were main earners of households (46 per cent) at the time training started. Similarly, each respondent type reported about the same distribution for number of unmarried children under 18 years old when training started: 54 per cent had none, 16 per cent had one, 19 per cent had two or three, and 12 per cent had four or more.

The different types of respondents reported about the same amount of unemployment. One-half of all respondents were unemployed at least five months in the year just before training. Among women, the proportion unemployed the entire year was smaller for "completers" (35 per cent) than for "dropouts" (51 per cent) or "controls" (47 per cent).

Of all respondents who had a full-time job sometime between September, 1961, and the start of training, one-half (53 per cent) earned less than $70 a week on their last full-time job before training. Wages were similar for each respondent type, though the proportion making at least $100 a week was slightly higher for "controls" (30 per cent) than for others (19 to 23 per cent). On the other hand, the proportion reporting no full-time job before training was slightly higher for "controls." Women received lower wages than men, and more women than men reported no full-time job before training.

Trainees and "controls" were in approximately similar financial situations just before training started. For all respondent types combined, a majority (53 per cent) said that their family incomes were under $60 a week; only 27 per cent reported $100 or more. Respondent types differed very little on family income, with "controls" having the highest incomes by a narrow margin.

Opinions of Training and Jobs

When asked to choose the most important reason for wanting to take a job training course from a list of nine possibilities, "controls" more often than others selected, "To get a job that paid more money" (20 per cent vs. 11 for "completers" and 15 for "dropouts"). "Controls" had the smallest proportion who said, "To learn new work skills" (19 per cent vs. 25 per cent or more). Even though the differences are fairly small, these items were used as variables in certain analyses in an attempt to control for motivation.

Why didn't "controls" take MDTA job training courses? One-half (51 per cent) didn't know about the program; 78 per cent of those who were not aware of the opportunity said "yes," they would have been interested in taking job training (another 10 per cent said, "It depends" on the type of training available or on other things). Many of those who did know about the MDTA program tried to participate but were not accepted.

Nearly one-half (48 per cent) of those who took or were referred to MDTA courses first heard about the training through the Employment Service.

The next most popular sources of first information were personal acquaintances (21 per cent) and the mass communications media (15 per cent--mainly newspapers).

About seven out of ten said that the couse to which they were referred was the type they really wanted. Then why did many fail to enroll? Among the multiple-response categories, the most popular were: 31 per cent got jobs or were called back to work, 28 per cent gave a financial reason, 15 per cent named transportation problems, and 11 per cent cited family responsibilities. One-tenth said that they did not realize they had been referred to MDTA courses. When asked if they think it would have been better if they had taken the courses to which they had been referred, 55 per cent said "yes."

A majority (55 per cent) of those who did not enroll in courses even though referred said they were still interested in government-sponsored training. Three-fourths of "controls" claimed to be interested in taking training to learn a skill or trade. More than one-half of those who said "no" explained that they had jobs.

Since two-thirds of the "dropouts" were in the type of training they "really wanted," why did they leave? Only 6 per cent disliked the instructors and only 13 per cent complained about something else in the MDTA program. One-third (35 per cent) left to take a job; 12 per cent listed money problems; 12 per cent cited personal illness; and 10 per cent referred to family problems. (Multiple responses were permitted.)

As expected, more "completers" than "dropouts" said they liked their MDTA courses "very well" (63 vs. 45 per cent). Similarly, when asked if they had learned certain specific skills in their training, more "completers" than "dropouts" said "yes" for operating equipment (80 vs. 52 per cent); using tools (62 vs. 51 per cent); and reading, writing, or arithmetic (61 vs. 53 per cent). About one-third of the trainees said they learned something they had not expected to learn (38 per cent of "completers" and 32 per cent of "dropouts"). When they left training, 67 per cent of "completers" and 31 per cent of "dropouts" felt well (or very well) qualified to begin work in the occupation for which they had taken training.

Did their MDTA training help them get jobs? Two-thirds (66 per cent) of "completers" and one-fourth (26 per cent) of "dropouts" said "yes." When those who said "no" were asked for reasons, only 10 per cent specifically blamed the training program. "Completers" frequently said there were no jobs open (35 per cent), or that they took a job not related to their training (29 per cent). "Dropouts" usually said that they were not in the course long enough to benefit from it (52 per cent), or that they took a job not related to their training (22 per cent).

How well did the training prepare them for their latest job? While 35 per cent of "completers" and 71 per cent of "dropouts" said, "Not well at all," most of those who gave such negative responses indicated that their latest jobs were in a different line of work, not related to their training (90 per cent for "completers," and 64 per cent for "dropouts").

When asked how much confidence they had in their ability to learn and hold a new job, three-fourths (77 per cent) of the trainees claimed "a lot" of confidence when interviewed, compared to one-half (50 per cent) before training. The increase between before and after training was greater for "completers" (from 46 to 79 per cent) than for "dropouts" (from 58 to 72 per cent).

How well did they like their latest jobs? Among those who had at least one full-time job since training, the proportion who answered "very well" was smaller for "controls" (42 per cent) than for trainees (62 per cent for "completers," and 59 per cent for "dropouts").

Two-thirds of those without full-time jobs when interviewed said they thought their chances of getting a job then were only fair (32 per cent) or poor (37 per cent). More "controls" than "completers" said their chances were poor (42 _vs_. 27 per cent). Among those who were not working full time when interviewed, 17 per cent said they had never been available for a full-time job since training. The proportion was smaller for "controls" (13 per cent) than for "completers" (23 per cent) or "dropouts" (22 per cent).

Did those without full-time employment want jobs enough to move to a different city to take a job? Two-thirds (67 per cent) said "yes," if the wage rate were higher than they were accustomed to, and one-half (50 per cent) said they would move for wages equal to what they had earned previously. "Controls" had proportions similar to "completers" and "dropouts" on this question.

Training and Income

While the basic goals of the MDTA program focus on altering the employment experience of the individual, increased earning power would be an important additional benefit of the program. But "completers" and "controls" reported about the same weekly wages on their last full-time job since training, with six out of the ten earning less than $80 a week. Only among women is training associated with higher wages: more women "completers" than "controls" earned at least $60 a week (53 vs. 34 per cent). But this association could be the result of other factors.

Multiple regression analysis was used to control for the effects of other factors on weekly wages and to determine the net effect of MDTA training. Ten "background" variables were included in the regression equation: sex, education, age, race, previous unemployment, main earner status, geographic region, marital status, number of unmarried children under 18 years old, and state per capita income.

When controlling for the ten "background" variables simultaneously, MDTA training had no statistically significant net effect on wages for last full-time job since training. The multiple correlation coefficient was increased from .55 to .67 by adding a measure for income before training[1] to the equation, but training still had no effect on later wages. The addition of factors for motivation (most important reason for taking training) and attitude (how well latest job liked) made no appreciable change in the regression results. Even when considering "completers" and "dropouts" separately, MDTA training had no effect on weekly wages for those who found full-time employment after training.

But not everyone did have a full-time job after training; some never worked at all and others had only part-time jobs. By using family income instead of full-time wages, it is possible to include such persons in the analysis. Because the number of wage earners in the family is not known, it is assumed that trainees and non-trainees are similar in average number of workers per family. "Completers" reported higher current (when interviewed) family incomes than "controls," suggesting that MDTA training might have some effect on family income. But other factors could be responsible for the association of respondent type and family income.

---

[1] Weekly wages on last full-time job before training.

The net effect of training on family income is estimated at \$9.60 a week when controlling for the background variables and for family income just before training. The addition of motivation and attitude factors (most important reason for taking training, and how well latest job liked) to the regression equation reduces the estimated net effect of MDTA training to \$7.87 a week. When "completers" and "dropouts" are considered separately, the net effect of completing training is estimated at \$10.08 a week, and no statistically significant effect is observed for "dropouts."[2]

Since MDTA training had no aggregate effect in the regressions on weekly wages for last full-time job since training, why should it affect family income? The probable answer lies in the fact that more "completers" than "controls" were employed when interviewed (78 vs. 55 per cent, with "dropouts" in between at 65 per cent). Because more trainees had jobs, trainees had a higher average family income than non-trainees. The logical conclusion is that MDTA training did not result in higher paying jobs, but it did lead to more employment.

---

[2] Even for "completers," the net effect of \$10.08 might or might not be statistically significant; its standard error in a random sample would be only \$2.80, but in the cluster sample used for this study the true value is probably larger. Although the net effect might not be quite statistically significant, the best available estimate is still \$10.08, and the probability that the net effect is zero would be very small. For "dropouts" the estimated net effect of training (\$3.61) is barely larger than its standard error would be in a random sample (\$3.47).

Training and Employment

How much effect did MDTA training have on employment? Since more "completers" than "controls" were high school graduates (49 *vs*. 32 per cent), part of the association between training and employment is probably due to educational differences. Other variables might also explain part of the relationship. Multiple regression analysis was again used to control for the effects of several variables at once.

The dependent variable in the regression equation was the per cent of months employed full time since training.[3] The proportion employed full time more than 80 per cent of the months since training was considerably higher for "completers" (52 per cent) and for "dropouts" (48 per cent) than for "controls" (20 per cent).

When controlling for the ten "background" variables, the estimated net effect of training is to increase full-time employment by 20 per cent of the period between training and interview.[4] That net effect represents over one-third of the mean employment level, which is 55 per cent. But that estimate is probably too high, because it fails to take into account a problem related to the definition of the period "after training."

For non-trainees, when did the period "after training" begin? The operational definition used in this study specifies the period "after training" as including all activities listed in the recent employment history table of the questionnaire, which really means three different definitions: (1) For trainees, including both "completers" and "dropouts," the period "after training" began right after they left MDTA training. (2) For a "control," it began right after the starting date of MDTA training for the corresponding trainee. (3) For a person who didn't enroll in the course to which he was referred, it began right after the starting date of that course.

---

[3] Three other dependent variables were also used, with similar results.

[4] The standard error is only 1.5 per cent, which means that the net effect of 20 per cent is statistically significant.

But that definition gives trainees an unfair advantage over "controls." A trainee could be looking for a job while taking training without being classified as unemployed during that time, but the corresponding "control" had no such interlude between his periods "before training" and "after training." Many trainees could begin their periods "after training" with full-time employment, but most controls had to begin unemployed.

When a control for first activity after training (full-time employment or not) was added to the regression equation, the estimated net effect of MDTA training on full-time employment was reduced to 9 per cent of the period after training. But this estimate is probably too low, because the correction (for the advantage trainees had in the previous regression) is actually too severe. Since the MDTA program attempted to place trainees in full-time jobs just after training, part of the effect of training is hidden by adding a control for first activity after training to the equation. Therefore, while the previous estimate of 20 per cent was probably too high, the present estimate of 9 per cent is probably too low.

The addition of motivation and attitude factors (most important reason for taking training, and how well latest job liked) had no appreciable effect. The net effect of training was still estimated as 9 per cent.

Not all persons in the sample were looking for full-time jobs after training, because of family responsibilities, health, or other reasons.

Since the proportion (of those not working full-time when interviewed) who said they had not been available for full-time employment since training was greater for "completers" (23 per cent) than for "controls" (13 per cent), excluding such persons from the analysis results in slightly higher estimates for the net effect of training on employment. When excluding persons not available for full-time jobs and controlling for the "background" variables,[5] the net effect of training on full-time employment is estimated as 22 per cent. When a control is added for the first activity after training (full-time employment or not), the estimated net effect of training is reduced to 11 per cent. Because the addition of that control represents an overcorrection, the true value for the net effect of MDTA training on full-time employment is estimated to be between 11 and 22 per cent of the period after training.

If job training has an effect on employment, that effect should be greater for those who completed training courses than for those who left before the courses ended. As expected, when "completers" and "dropouts" are considered separately, the estimated net effect of training is larger for "completers" (between 13 and 23 per cent) than for "dropouts" (between 7 and 19 per cent). While the difference between the two types of trainees is not necessarily statistically significant,[6] it is in the expected direction and is probably real.

---

[5] Only seven of the ten "background" variables are included because the other three have no appreciable effect on the results. The three omitted are marital status, number of unmarried children under 18 years old, and state per capita income.

[6] It would be significant in a random sample, but might or might not be in this cluster sample.

Do length and type of training make any difference in employment? Cross-classification indicates that among either "completers" or "dropouts," persons with at least three months of training have a little more employment than others. And trainees in courses for skilled or semi-skilled jobs made better employment records than those in courses for service or clerical occupations. But when controlling for course completion and for the "background" variables, neither length nor type of training had a statistically significant net effect on full-time employment.

This raises some doubts about the effect of MDTA training on employment, since it is mathematically possible--though unlikely--that it makes no difference how much or what type of training one takes. It is quite possible that a large part of the estimated net effect of training is due to some other variable not included in the analysis. Whatever predisposes certain people to take job training could also be responsible for most of their increased employment, relative to non-trainees.

Conclusion

Except for the descriptive findings on the reactions of trainees to the MDTA program, most of the results of this research are based on comparisons of trainees to a control group of non-trainees. Since control group persons were not matched to corresponding trainees on several relevant variables, the two groups differ somewhat on certain factors, such as age and education. While the effects of all such known differences were controlled in the analysis, it is possible that unknown differences could have affected the findings.[7]

---

[7] The only way to avoid all such differences is to have an experimental situation in which a large sample is randomly divided into two groups, one to receive training and the other to be the control group.

For "controls," the period "after training" included the months while their corresponding trainees were in the MDTA program. As pointed out earlier, this research covers a time period in which unemployment rates in the United States were dropping. Therefore, the extra months for "controls" were months during which it was harder to find jobs than later in the period "after training." This tends to erroneously inflate the estimated net effect of MDTA training on employment.

While such problems are probably not serious enough to negate the findings, they do exist. Accordingly, the estimates of the net effect of training on employment should be regarded as rough estimates and not as specific authoritative "facts."

The major unresolved question is how much of the estimated net effect of training on employment is really due to some other variable not included in the analysis. An attempt was made to include all available information which might contribute to the explanation of employment differences, but most of the variables included are demographic. It is probably that motivation, intelligence, or other factors have some contribution to make. Those who want jobs the most and who have the best minds might be most likely both to find employment and to use every available means to obtain employment, including MDTA job training courses. Therefore, the true effect of training on employment may well be smaller than the estimates given in this report. Until such factors are included in analyses of the effects of training, however, the present estimates are the best available.

To put the entire research project in a very small nutshell: while some trainees said they learned little or nothing in their MDTA courses, most gave favorable evaluations; MDTA training apparently did not help get better paying jobs, but it did help them to obtain more full-time employment; the net effect of MDTA training on full-time employment is estimated to be between 13 and 23 per cent of the period after training for "completers" and between 7 and 19 per cent for "dropouts."

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE DESIGN

MDTA Trainees

The universe for the sample of trainees consists of the approximately 25,000 men and women enrolled in MDTA training programs originally scheduled for completion during July-September, 1964.[1] The overall sampling rate for this group was set at .075 to obtain approximately 1,800 cases since it was anticipated that this number would need to be sampled to locate 1,250 respondents for analysis. The loss was not predicted because of expected refusals; past experience indicates that there should be hardly any refusals. But there would naturally be a substantial group of trainees who could not be located, since the latest addresses available were one and one-half years old.

Non-Southern MDTA Trainees

Considering the United States as broken into the four major census divisions--Northeast, Midwest, South, and Mountain and West--MDTA trainees are distributed roughly in proportion to population except in the South. In the South, there is a very heavy concentration of trainees in Kentucky and South Carolina. For this reason, the NORC national sample PSU's (primary sampling units) were judged satisfactory everywhere except in the South. The sample was designed to be self-weighting. Therefore, within a NORC PSU the sampling rate was determined by the equation:

---

[1] Several of the course schedules were later changed. In order to prevent the sample size from being drastically reduced, persons were regarded as eligible if their courses ended between June 1, 1964, and February 28, 1965.

Overall rate (.075) = PSU Selection Probability X Within-PSU Selection Probability

Since the PSU selection probabilities are known, the within-PSU selection probabilities can be determined immediately. In the largest standard metropolitan areas, such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, which fell into the NORC sample with certainty, the within-sampling rate was, of course, also .075.

In a typical smaller PSU such as South Bend, which had a probability of .1074 of falling into NORC's national sample, the within-PSU sampling rate was .075/.1074 = .698.

In the three smallest NORC PSU's which fell into the sample the within-PSU sampling rate was greater than 1.0 since the PSU selection probability was less than .075. That problem was handled by sampling the required additional number of MDTA trainees from counties adjacent to the selected county in addition to sampling all trainees in the PSU. This eliminated the need for additional weighting which would have complicated the analysis.

Southern MDTA Trainees

In the South an entirely new sample of PSU's was selected with probabilities proportionate to size. Twenty PSU's were selected and the sampling interval for selection of PSU was 500. Therefore, the probability of selection of a PSU was n/500 where n was the total number of MDTA trainees within the PSU. Again, since the overall sampling rate was .075, the within-PSU rate could be determined. This procedure led to average samples of 37.5 cases within a PSU. This was considered about the optimum clustering for this sample, considering funds available and the fact that trainees who enrolled at a labor office might live long distances in any direction from that office.

As in the other sections of the United States, two PSU's had sampling rates greater than 1.0. Again, this was handled by drawing the additional samples required from adjacent counties.

Control Group

For analytic purposes it is critical that the trainees be compared to a control group which is as similar to the training group as possible except that they received no training. For this study, the control group consists of two sub-samples:

a) Men and women who were referred to MDTA training programs scheduled for completion during July-September, 1964, but who never entered a class, and

b) Neighbors, friends, and relatives of MDTA trainees who were unemployed at about the time the training courses started.

The control group sample size was also set at 1,800 to achieve a sample of 1,250 for analysis.

Referred-but-Did-Not-Enroll Control Group

About 8 per cent of all those who were referred to MDTA training programs failed to enroll and to participate. This varies considerably by labor office and may indicate some difference in practices in the various offices. To control for this, the sample size for those who failed to enroll was set at one-fifth the sample for trainees. Thus, if a sample of forty trainees was chosen from a PSU, a sample of eight "didn't enroll" persons was also chosen. This is not a self-weighting sample of this group, but rather a sample which provides the best possible match to the training group. The estimated size of this subsample was 250 cases, since in some PSU's there were too few of this group to make up the 20 per cent of the trainee sample size. Here, if there were too few cases nothing could be done since adding "didn't enroll" cases from other PSU's would lessen the value of the control group.

Snowball Sample

Each trainee was asked to give the names and addresses of up to three neighbors, friends, or relatives who were unemployed at the time he started training. The interviewer was to interview the first person of the same sex mentioned if that person could be located, otherwise using the second person. If no eligible control group person could be obtained through personal referral, the interviewer was to canvass up to 50 homes in the trainee's neighborhood in an attempt to find a person who was unemployed within three months of the starting date for the trainee's MDTA course.

The rationale for this sampling method is the fact that friends, relatives, and neighbors of MDTA trainees would, in general, be similar to the trainees in those social and demographic characteristics which are of greatest concern in the analysis. While snowball samples have been used in other situations (particularly in the sampling of elite groups), there is not much evidence on their use with groups such as MDTA trainees. The results of this study could lead to the development of procedures for obtaining control groups which are otherwise not well defined.

APPENDIX B

ESTIMATES OF SAMPLING ERROR

A cluster sample design was used in this study for the sake of economic efficiency. Therefore, the random sample formula for computing the standard error of a proportion is not applicable. A method for estimating the standard error in a cluster sample is provided by Kish and Hess.[1] In this method, the PSU's (primary sampling units) are divided into pairs which are as similar as possible, and differences between the PSU's in each pair are combined according to this formula:

$$\text{S.E.} = \frac{1}{X^2}\left[\sum_{1}^{n}(dY_i)^2 + \left(\frac{Y}{X}\right)^2\sum_{1}^{n}(dX_i)^2 - \frac{2Y}{X}\sum_{1}^{n}(dY_i)(dX_i)\right]$$

in which: Y = the numerator of the proportion (Y/X) for which the standard error is desired

X = the denominator of the proportion

n = the number of pairs of PSU's[2]

dY_i = the difference between the proportion numerators in the two PSU's of pair i

dX_i = the difference between the proportion denominators in the two PSU's of pair i

---

[1] Kish, L. and Hess, I. "On the Variances of Ratios and Their Differences in Multi-Stage Samples," JASA, 54: 416-46.

[2] If there is an odd number of PSU's in the sample, one PSU is omitted from the computation. Those large PSU's which fall into the sample with certainty are each divided into two groups of persons which are then treated as a pair of PSU's.

For example, consider the proportion of MDTA trainees who said that they learned to operate equipment (Table II.8):

$Y = 838$, the number who learned to operate equipment

$X = 1,187$, the number who answered the question

$n = 29$ pairs of PSU's

$Y/X = 838/1,187 = .71$

For the first pair of PSU's, $dY_i = 1$ because 5 persons in PSU number 1 and 4 persons in PSU number 2 learned to operate equipment (5-4 = 1).

For the first pair of PSU's, $dX_i = 0$ because 5 persons in each PSU answered the question (5-5 = 0).

After computing dY_i and dX_i for each of the 29 pairs of PSU's and putting all of the necessary data into the formula, the estimated standard error for the proportion who said that they learned to operate equipment is .027 (the proportion itself is .71).

This estimate is larger than the standard error computed by the random sample formula. For a random sample:

$$S.E. = \sqrt{pq/(n-1)}$$

in which: p = the proportion for which the standard error is desired

$q = 1 - p$

n = sample size

For the proportion who said that they learned to operate equipment (835/1,187), the standard error computed by the random sample formula is .013. The cluster sample estimate is twice as large as the random sample standard error. (The ratio is 2.0 using unrounded data.)

Similar computations were made for many other variables used in this report; the resulting standard error estimates are listed in Table A.1 along with the ratio of the estimate to the random sample formula result. The ratios vary from 1.1 to 3.8, with a median of 1.85. Of the 34 ratios listed, all but 10 are less than 2.5. For any proportion not listed, a rough estimate of the standard error may be obtained by using the random sample formula and multiplying the result by 1.85 (the median ratio in the table).

The standard error estimates and ratios in Table A.1 are probably slightly larger than necessary. While all 2,258 cases were regarded as eligible for computing random sample results, the 123 duplicated cases (see footnote 3 in Chapter I) were excluded from the cluster sample computations. The resulting sample size is slightly smaller, which increases the standard error estimate.

TABLE A.1

ESTIMATES FOR STANDARD ERROR OF PROPORTIONS FOR CLUSTER SAMPLE

Variable	Proportion	Estimated Standard Error	Ratio of Estimate to Random Sample Formula Result
1. Completers/main sample	.59	.024	1.8
2. Completers/trainees	.65	.023	1.7
3. Three or more months of training/ trainees	.54	.029	2.1
4. Fair or poor on chances of job before training (Q. 15)	.71	.014	1.1
5. Liked training very well (Q. 17A)	.57	.018	1.3
6. Learned to operate equipment (Q. 18A)	.71	.027	2.0
7. Learned to use tools (Q. 18B).	.58	.029	2.0
8. Learned reading, writing, arithmetic (Q. 18C)	.58	.031	2.2
9. Learned something not expected (Q. 20)	.36	.022	1.4
10. Had a lot of confidence before training (Q. 22)	.50	.019	1.3
11. Had a lot of confidence when interviewed (Q. 23)	.77	.014	1.2
12. Well qualified after training (Q. 24)	.55	.021	1.5
13. Family income before training under $60/week (Q. 29A) . .	.55	.029	2.0
14. Employed full-time when interviewed (Q. 34G)	.66	.021	1.6
15. Employed when interviewed . . (Q. 34A)	.73	.019	1.5
16. Training helped to get a job (Q. 42A)	.53	.018	1.2
17. Completed high school (Q. 45)	.43	.039	2.9

Continued

TABLE A.1--Continued

Variable	Proportion	Estimated Standard Error	Ratio of Estimate to Random Sample Formula Result
18. Family income when interviewed under $100/week (Q. 49) . . .	.50	.019	1.4
19. Male sex (Q. 52A)	.63	.051	3.8
20. White race (Q. 52B)	.63	.036	2.7
21. Household under 5 persons at start of training (Q. 50A) .	.59	.023	1.7
22. No unmarried children under 18 years old (Q. 50A, B, C) . .	.53	.028	2.0
23. Under 25 years old at start of training (Q. 50B)	.47	.047	3.4
24. Never married at start of training (Q. 50C)	.35	.040	3.1
25. Main earner of household at start of training (Q. 50D) .	.47	.049	3.6
26. Wages on last full-time job before training under $60/week (Q. 27C)	.42	.061	3.6
27. Unemployed 4 or more months in year before training (Q. 27A, D, E)	.52	.040	2.6
28. Working full-time over 80% of months since training (Q. 34E, F, G)	.50	.026	1.9
29. Unemployed under 20% of months since training (Q. 34A, E, F)	.60	.022	1.6
30. Wages on last full-time job since training under $70/week (Q. 34D)	.44	.043	2.9
31. Wages on last full-time job since training under $80/week (Q. 34D)	.58	.047	3.2
32. Unemployed 1 month or less in year after training (Q. 34A, E, F)	.51	.026	1.8
33. Working full-time at least 11 months in year after training (Q. 34E, F, G)	.45	.024	1.7
34. Ever worked full-time since training (Q. 34G)	.87	.014	1.6

APPENDIX C

MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS

The multiple regression results which are essential to the conclusions of the study are included at appropriate places in the report. Some of them are repeated in Tables A.3 to A.5, along with results of other regressions for employment. Additional regression results for weekly wages on last full-time job since training are given in Table A.2.

The 123 duplicated cases (see footnote 3, Chapter I) were excluded from all multiple regressions.

TABLE A.2

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS FOR WEEKLY WAGES ON LAST FULL-TIME JOB SINCE TRAINING

Multiple r	"Completers"		"Dropouts"		Independent Variables (In Addition to Training Variables)
	b_1 (Net Effect in $/Week)	Standard Error of b_1	b_2 (Net Effect in $/Week)	Standard Error of b_2	
.55	-2.15	2.02	-2.29	2.50	B ("Background" from Table III.2)
.68	1.54	1.80	- .70	2.22	B, Weekly wages on last full-time job before training
.69	- .51	1.81	-2.41	2.21	B, Weekly wages on last full-time job before training, Most important reason for taking training, How well latest job liked

TABLE A. 3

VARIABLES INCLUDED IN MULTIPLE REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT AND FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Regression Number[a]	Dependent Variables[b]	Persons Excluded	Independent Variables (In Addition to Training Variables)
1A,B	MF %F MU %U	None	B ("Background" from Table III.2)
2A,B	MF %F MU %U	None	B, Full-time employment just after training
3A,B	MF %F MU %U	None	B, Full-time employment just after training, Most important reason for training is to learn new skills, Most important reason for training is to get a job with more money, Latest job liked very well
4A,B	MF %F MU %U	None	B, Employed just after training
5A,B	%F %U	None	Short B (B minus variables 8,9,10 of Table III.2)
6A,B	%F %U	"Didn't Enrolls"	Short B
7A,B	MF %F MU %U	Not available (for full-time job)	Short B
8A,B	MF %F	Not available	Short B, Full-time employment just after training
9A,B	MU %U	Not available	Short B, Employed just after training
10A,B	MF %F MU %U	Not working full time just after training, Not available	Short B
11A,B	MF %F MU %U	Working full time just after training, Not available	Short B

[a] The A and B after each number refer to separate equations in which only the training variables differ--A: All trainees are considered together. B: "Completers" and "dropouts" are each compared to non-trainees. Since only one dependent variable is used in each equation, the first line represents eight equations (1A and 1B for each of four dependent variables).

[b] A separate equation is used for each dependent variable, of course. MF = Months of Full-time employment in the year just after training; %F = Per cent of months of Full-time employment between training and date of interview; MU = Months Unemployed in the year just after training; %U = Per cent of months Unemployed between training and date of interview.

TABLE A.4

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

Regression Number[a] (And Type of Trainee for which Coefficients Are Listed)	Dependent Variable					
	Number of Months Employed Full-time during the Year Just after Training			Per Cent of Months Employed Full-time between Training and Date of Interview		
	Multiple r	Training Coefficient (Net Effect in Months)	Ratio of Coefficient to Standard Error	Multiple r	Training Coefficient (Net Effect in Per Cent)	Ratio of Coefficient to Standard Error
All trainees						
1A	.54	2.8	14.4	.53	20	13.2
2A	.74	1.3	8.1	.70	9	6.8
3A	.75	1.3	7.7	.70	9	6.3
4A	.67	1.9	10.7	.61	14	9.9
5A	---	---	----	.53	20	13.3
6A	---	---	----	.54	22	14.4
7A	.54	3.0	14.8	.53	22	14.0
8A	.74	1.5	8.9	.69	11	7.9
10A	.27	.5	2.3	.28	6	3.2
11A	.51	2.1	8.6	.47	14	7.1
Completers						
1B	.55	3.1	14.1	.53	22	13.1
2B	.75	1.6	9.0	.70	12	7.8
3B	.75	1.6	8.6	.70	11	7.3
4B	.68	2.1	10.9	.61	17	10.2
5B	---	---	----	.53	22	13.1
6B	---	---	----	.54	25	14.2
7B	.55	3.2	14.1	.53	23	13.4
8B	.74	1.8	9.4	.69	13	8.4
10B	.27	.5	2.1	.28	6	3.1
11B	.52	2.5	9.3	.48	17	7.7
Dropouts						
1B	.55	2.3	8.4	.53	16	7.5
2B	.75	.7	3.3	.70	5	2.5
3B	.75	.7	3.0	.70	4	2.1
4B	.68	1.4	5.8	.61	10	5.1
5B	---	---	----	.53	16	7.6
6B	---	---	----	.54	18	8.5
7B	.55	2.6	9.3	.53	19	8.6
8B	.74	1.0	4.3	.69	7	3.7
10B	.27	.5	2.0	.28	5	2.3
11B	.52	1.1	2.8	.48	7	2.3

[a] The numbered regressions are described in Table A.3.

TABLE A.5

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

Regression Number[a] (And Type of Trainee for Which Coefficients Are Listed)	Dependent Variable					
	Number of Months Unemployed during the Year Just after Training			Per Cent of Months Unemployed between Training and Date of Interview		
	Multiple r	Training Coefficient (Net Effect in Months)	Ratio of Coefficient to Standard Error	Multiple r	Training Coefficient (Net Effect in Per Cent)	Ratio of Coefficient to Standard Error
All trainees						
1A	.52	-2.5	13.2	.50	-16	11.4
2A	.66	-1.4	7.8	.60	- 9	6.6
3A	.66	-1.3	7.5	.60	- 9	6.2
4A	.73	-1.4	8.9	.66	- 9	7.0
5A	---	----	----	.50	-16	11.5
6A	---	----	----	.50	-18	12.2
7A	.51	-2.7	13.5	.50	-17	11.7
9A	.72	-1.5	9.4	.65	-10	7.5
10A	.26	- .7	3.0	.27	- 5	3.1
11A	.48	-2.0	7.4	.46	-12	5.8
Completers						
1B	.52	-2.9	13.5	.50	-19	11.8
2B	.67	-1.7	9.0	.60	-12	7.7
3B	.67	-1.7	8.7	.60	-11	7.3
4B	.73	-1.7	9.9	.66	-11	8.1
5B	---	----	----	.50	-19	11.9
6B	---	----	----	.51	-20	12.5
7B	.52	-2.9	13.3	.50	-19	11.7
9B	.72	-1.8	10.0	.66	-12	8.2
10B	.26	- .6	2.5	.27	- 5	3.0
11B	.49	-2.6	8.7	.47	-15	6.7
Dropouts						
1B	.52	-1.9	7.0	.50	-11	5.8
2B	.67	- .6	2.6	.60	- 4	2.1
3B	.67	- .6	2.5	.60	- 4	1.9
4B	.73	- .8	3.5	.66	- 4	2.3
5B	---	----	----	.50	-12	5.9
6B	---	----	----	.51	-13	6.6
7B	.52	-2.2	7.8	.50	-13	6.5
9B	.72	-1.0	4.4	.66	- 5	3.1
10B	.26	- .8	2.8	.27	- 5	2.3
11B	.49	- .6	1.4	.47	- 4	1.1

---

[a] The numbered regressions are described in Table A.3.

APPENDIX D

EMPLOYERS' EVALUATIONS OF TRAINEES

A poor response rate makes the employers' evaluations questionable. Trainees were asked for the name and address of each employer worked for since training. Wherever possible, questionnaires were mailed to the first and last employers for full-time jobs.[1] Two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed, only 26 per cent of them had been returned in usable condition. Two weeks after another copy of the questionnaire was sent to non-respondents, a total of 45 per cent (from both mailings) had been returned in usable condition. Past experience indicates that another mailing might have increased the response rate as high as 55 per cent, but this was regarded as too low for reliability.

In order to achieve a higher response rate, telegrams were sent to all non-respondents instead of mailing a third copy of the questionnaire. The telegram repeated only four of the thirteen questions on the questionnaires. The telegram also asked if the trainee had worked for the employer at any time in the last four years, since it was thought

---

[1] In addition to the questionnnaire about the specific trainee, each employer received another questionnaire about MDTA trainees in general. Because the response rate was even poorer for the general questionnaire, the results were never tabulated.

3

that some of the non-respondents had not replied because they had never even heard of the MDTA trainee they had been asked to evaluate. This was apparently true for a small proportion of employers; 34 of the telegram responses indicated that the trainees had not worked there. In an attempt to boost the response rate as high as possible, employers were invited to reply to the telegram by collect telegrams or collect telephone calls (or by mail with no postage required, as they were asked to do earlier).

The usable responses (not counting the 34 trainees whose "employers" did not recognize the trainees' names), after combining telegram responses with questionnaires, finally reached a total of 1,199--78 per cent of the sample size (1,546). Some questionnaires were returned after the telegrams were sent, which raised the usable response rate to 54 per cent for those questions not included in the telegram. This was regarded as too low for reliability unless the telegram responses indicated practically no bias associated with late response.

Unfortunately, the 359 telegram responses differ sharply from the 840 questionnaires on the proportion of trainees still working for the responding employers. About one-half (49 per cent) of the questionnaires indicated that the trainees were still employees, compared to only a little over one-fourth (28 per cent) of the telegram responses. This indicates that questions answered by only the 54 per cent who returned questionnaires may be subject to considerable non-response bias. Therefore, the reliability of all items in Table A.6 for which the percentage base (N) is 840 or less should be regarded as questionable--except for the very last item, which applies only to persons no longer working for the responding employers.[2]

Another difference between telegram responses and questionnaires is related to the first. The proportion of the responses which were from the trainees' last employers was greater for questionnaires than for telegrams (72 vs. 57 per cent). But the proportion of responses which were from the trainees' first employers was only slightly smaller for the questionnaires than for the telegrams (61 vs. 66 per cent), because more of the questionnaires were received from the trainees' only employers (33 vs. 23 per cent).

Considering both telegram responses and questionnaires together, the proportion of replies which were for "completers" (69 per cent) was only slightly higher than the proportion of all trainees in the study who are "completers" (65 per cent). Two-thirds (67 per cent) of the replies were from last employers, and nearly as many (62 per cent) were from first employers (30 per cent were from only employers), with similar proportions for both "completers" and "dropouts." Less than one-half (43 per cent) of the trainees were reported as still working for the responding employers, with a little larger proportion for "completers" than for "dropouts" (45 vs. 37 per cent).

Employers rated their MDTA employees fairly high on the two specific evaluation questions. Only 10 per cent were graded "poor" on work quality, and 61 per cent were rated "good" or better. On attendance, only 14 per cent were judged to be "worse than most," and 23 per cent were regarded as "better than most." The two types of trainees had similar distributions on those two items, though slightly more "dropouts" than "completers" were rated as "worse than most" on attendance (18 vs. 12 per cent).

---

[2] Not all of the information from the questionnaires is listed in Table A.6. Only pre-coded data were tabulated.

TABLE A.6

SELECTED ITEMS FROM THE EMPLOYER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

(Per Cent)

Item (and NA, Not Applicable)	Categories	Per Cent
Respondent type	Completer	69
	Dropout	31
NA= 0	Total .	100
Not applicable= 0	N . . .	(1,199)
Which employer	First	32
	Last	37
	Only (first and last) . .	30
NA= 2	Total .	99
Not applicable= 0	N . . .	(1,197)
Q. 2A. Was he hired for work related to his training?	Yes	50
	No	50
NA=111	Total .	100
Not applicable=359	N . . .	(729)
Q. 4. How was he hired?	Referred by Employment Service	17
	Referred by private agency	3
	Recruited by employer . .	5
	Referred by MDTA program	11
	Referred by a union . . .	1
	Applied on his own . . .	47
	Other	16
NA= 37	Total .	100
Not applicable=359	N . . .	(803)
Q. 5. Quality of his work	Very good	15
	Good	46
	Fair	29
	Poor	10
NA=111	Total .	100
Not applicable= 0	N . . .	(1,088)
Q. 6. Attendance, compared to others in same job	Better than most	23
	About the same	63
	Worse than most	14
NA= 86	Total .	100
Not applicable= 0	N . . .	(1,113)

Continued

TABLE A.6--Continued

Item (and NA, Not Applicable)	Categories	Per Cent
Q. 7a. Has he received a "non-routine" wage increase?	Yes	32
	No	68
NA=175	Total .	100
Not applicable=359	N . . .	(665)
Q. 7b. Has he received a promotion?	Yes	20
	No	80
NA=191	Total .	100
Not applicable=359	N . . .	(649)
Q. 7c. Has he been promoted to a supervisory job?	Yes	2
	No	98
NA=221	Total .	100
Not applicable=359	N . . .	(619)
Q. 8. Does he still work there?	Yes	43
	No	57
NA= 16	Total .	100
Not applicable= 0	N . . .	(1,183)
Q. 10. Is his current work related to his MDTA training?	Yes	46
	No	54
NA= 44	Total .	100
Not applicable=794	N . . .	(361)
Q. 13. Why was his employment terminated?	He was not competent .	12
	Attendance was irregular	9
	Laid off--not enough work	16
	Laid off--reorganization	1
	He resigned	52
	Other	18
NA= 19	Total .	108
Not applicable=519	N . . .	(661)

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

Survey 504
April, 1966
DL/MT-1003-C
BB 44-6608
Approval expires 6-30-66

MDTA EMPLOYER'S QUESTIONNAIRE - C

1. When did you hire this person? ______________________
Month (11-12/XX) Day (13-14/XX) Year (15-16/XX)

DECK 23

2. For what job or occupation was he hired? (17-19/YYY)

____

A. Was that work related to the training that he took? (Circle one)
Yes No (20/9)

---

3. What were his weekly wages when he was hired? (21-23/XXX)
$______________

---

4. How was this person hired? (Circle one) (24/9)
He was referred by the Employment Service.........1
He was referred by a private employment agency....2
Our organization recruited him....................3
He was referred by the MDTA training facility.....4
He was referred by a union........................5
He applied for the job on his own.................6
Other (Specify)...................................7
____

---

5. How would you evaluate the quality of his work? (25/9)
Very good 1
Good. 2
Fair. 3
Poor. 4
No records. 5

---

6. How did his attendance compare with other workers with the same job? (26/9)
Better than most. 1
About the same 2
Worse than most 3

(OVER)

7. Has he received any of the following? (Circle one in each row)

	Yes	No	
a. A "non-routine" (not through a new union contract or automatic) increase in wages	1	2	(27/9)
b. A promotion to a higher classification	1	2	(28/9)
c. A promotion to a supervisory position	1	2	(29/9)

8. Is this person still in your employ? (Circle one)

Yes	No	
1	2	(30/9)

IF YES:

9. What are his present weekly earnings? $ ______________ (31-33/RRR)

10. Is his current work related to the MDTA training that he t

Yes	1	(34/R)
No	2	
Current job is same as first job.	3	

IF NO:

11. When was he terminated or laid off?

Month	Day	Year
(35-36/RR)	(37-38/RR)	(39-40/RR)

12. What were his weekly earnings at that time?

$ ______________ (41-43/RRR)

13. Why was his employment with your company terminated? (Circle as many as apply)

He was not competent to do the work for which he was hired..	1	(44/R)
His attendance was irregular....................................	2	
He was laid off because there was not enough work...........	3	
He was laid off because his section was being reorganized...	4	
He resigned..	5	
Other (Please specify) ______________________	6	

Survey 504
Bureau of the
Budget Number:
44-6552
Expires 6/30/66

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

TIME BEGAN: ________ AM PM

CASE NUMBER:

MAIN SAMPLE

Hello. I'm (your name) of the National Opinion Research Center.

We're making a survey for the Department of Labor and the Office of Education on how their manpower training program can be improved. I understand you were (in the program at one time) (selected for the program at one time even though you didn't actually enroll) and I would like to get some of your opinions about it.

(I want to emphasize that all of your answers will be kept confidential. The information we collect will be combined with answers from other individuals and no one will ever be reporting or checking on you as an individual.)

BEGIN DECK 02

According to what I have here, you (entered training/were selected for training) as ______________________ (FS Item C) and the course started on
Occupation

______________________ (FS Item E). Is that right? IF MINOR
Date

DISCREPANCIES, CORRECT FACE SHEET.

Yes . . (GO TO Q. 1)	1	10/9
No . . . (DISCONTINUE INTERVIEW) .	2	

IF THE CLASSIFICATION FOR THE RESPONDENT (FS Item L) IS NOT LISTED ON THE FACE SHEET OR IS AMBIGUOUS, ASK A.

A. Did you complete the training program or leave it before it ended?

Completed	1
Left before ended	2
Did not enroll	3

IF NECESSARY, CORRECT FACE SHEET, ITEM L.

1. How did you first hear about the MDTA training (in which you were enrolled/for which you were selected)? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD VERBATIM, PROBING AS NECESSARY TO CIRCLE ONE CODE.

Radio/television	0	11/9
Newspaper	1	
Friend	2	
Parent or relative	3	
Posting at Employment Service Office	4	
Employment Service interviewer . .	5	
Welfare worker	6	
Employer, company (company employment office)	7	
Other (SPECIFY) ______________	8	

2. Was the particular job training (in which you were enrolled/for which you were selected) the type of training you really wanted?

Yes . . (GO TO Q. 3) . . 1   12/9
No . . . (ASK A AND B) . . 2

IF NO:

A. What would have been your first choice?

B. Did you ask to be enrolled in training for your first choice?

Yes . . (ASK C AND D) . . 1   15/R
No . . . (ASK E) 2

IF YES TO B:

C. To your knowledge, was training in your first choice being offered at any school near you at the same time?

Yes 1   16/R
No 2

D. Why weren't you offered this type of training?

IF NO TO B: E. Why not?

3. A. Here are some reasons people have given for wanting to enter an MDTA training program. Please tell me for each one whether that was a reason that applied to you? READ EACH ITEM BELOW AND CIRCLE YES OR NO CODE FOR EACH.

	A.		
	Yes	No	
To get a job in a different line of work	1	0	21/X
To learn new work skills	2	0	22/X
To get a job that paid more money	3	0	23/X
To get a more interesting job	4	0	24/X
To get a job that was steady, regular employment	5	0	25/X
To get an easier job	6	0	26/X
To improve my skills or knowledge for a job I already had	7	0	27/X
Just to get a job, no matter what it was	8	0	28/X
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	9	0	29/X

B. IF ONLY ONE REASON GIVEN IN "A," ENTER THAT CODE IN THE BOX BELOW WITHOUT ASKING. You told me that (READ ITEMS CODED "YES" IN COLUMN A) were reasons for your wanting to enter the training program. Which of these would you say was the most important reason for your wanting to enter the training program? ENTER CODE NUMBER IN BOX.

☐ 30/X

ASK Q. 4 ONLY FOR THOSE ENROLLED IN COURSE ON FACE SHEET (FS ITEM L). FOR OTHERS, SKIP TO Q. 5.

4. Do you know of anybody other than yourself who was unemployed at the time you started training?

Yes	1	31/9
No	2	

ASK Q's 5-14 ONLY OF THOSE WHO WERE SELECTED FOR A TRAINING COURSE BUT DID NOT ENROLL. SKIP TO Q. 15 IF DID ENROLL. (FACE SHEET, ITEM L.)

5. Could you tell me why you did not take the training course for which you were selected? (PROBE: Any other reason?)

---

6. Considering everything that's happened to you since then, do you think it would have been better if you had taken that course?

Yes, it would have been better . . . 4 34/R
No, it wouldn't 5
Don't know 6

---

7. Are you still interested in government-sponsored training?

Yes 1 35/R
No 2
Depends . . . (ASK A) 3

A. What would it depend on?

---

8. Were you offered any other training at the time you didn't enroll?

Yes 4 38/R
No 5

---

9. Since (date, FS Item E) have you taken some kind of job training course?

Yes . . . . . (ASK A) 1 39/R
No . . . . . . (SKIP TO Q. 27) . . . 2

A. How many courses did you take?

ENTER NUMBER HERE ☐ 40/R

IF RESPONDENT TOOK ONE OR TWO COURSES, ASK Q's 10-14 ABOUT ONE OR BOTH COURSES. IF RESPONDENT TOOK MORE THAN TWO COURSES, SAY: "Let's just talk about the first two training courses you took."

10. What job(s) did this training prepare you for? RECORD VERBATIM FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

FIRST COURSE	SECOND COURSE

11. As far as you know, who sponsored this training program--MDTA, ARA, Vocational Education, your state government, local school board, or who? CIRCLE ONE CODE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE		SECOND COURSE	
MDTA	1	47/R	1	48/R
ARA	2		2	
Vocational Education	3		3	
State government	4		4	
Local school board	5		5	
Other (SPECIFY)	6		6	

12. When did that training program start? RECORD DATE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE			SECOND COURSE		
	Month	Year		Month	Year	
49-50 RR		'6	51/R	52-53 RR		'6	54/R

13. Did you complete that training program or leave it before it ended? CIRCLE ONE CODE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE		SECOND COURSE	
Completed course	1	55/R	1	56/R
Left course	2		2	
Course still in progress . .	3		3	

14. When did you (complete/leave) this program? RECORD DATE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE				SECOND COURSE		
	Month	Year			Month	Year	
57-58 RR		'6	59/R	60-61 RR		'6	62/R

NOW SKIP TO Q. 27

BEGIN DECK 03

ASK Q's 15-26 ONLY OF THOSE WHO WERE ENROLLED IN TRAINING COURSE. FOR THOSE WHO DID NOT ENROLL, SKIP TO Q. 27. (FACE SHEET ITEM L.)

15. Thinking back to just before you heard about the training, at that time how good did you think your chances would have been of finding a job, any kind of job, without taking the training--very good, good, fair, or poor?

Very good . . .	(SKIP TO Q. 17) . .	1	32/R
Good	(SKIP TO Q. 17) . .	2	
Fair	(GO TO Q. 16) . . .	3	
Poor	(GO TO Q. 16) . . .	4	
Had a job immediately prior to training . . .	(SKIP TO Q. 17) . .	5	

---

16. A. What were the main reasons why you found it difficult to get a job before you entered training? (PROBE: What other important reasons?)

IF ONLY ONE REASON MENTIONED IN A, GO TO C WITHOUT ASKING B.

B. Which of these reasons do you think was the most important?

C. Has the training helped you in any way to overcome these difficulties?

Yes	(ASK D)	1	37/R
No	(GO TO Q. 17) . . .	2	

IF YES TO C:

D. In what way?

17. A. All things considered, how well did you like the training--very well, fairly well, not so well, or not at all?

Very well . . . (ASK B) 3 40/R
Fairly well . . (ASK B AND C) . . . 4
Not so well . . (ASK B AND C) . . . 5
Not at all . . . (ASK C) 6

B. What did you like about the training? (PROBE: Anything else?)

C. What were some of the things you did not like about the training? (PROBE: Anything else?)

---

18. I'm interested specifically in what you learned while in manpower training: For example, did you learn. . . . CIRCLE YES OR NO CODE FOR EACH ITEM.

	Yes	No	
A. How to operate equipment?	2	3	45/R
B. How to use tools?	5	6	46/R
C. To read and write better, or to do arithmetic?	2	3	47/R
D. Anything I haven't mentioned?	5	6	48/R

IF YES TO D: What?

---

19. (In addition to what you have already told me), what (other) new skills did you learn in this MDTA training?

IF NO NEW SKILLS MENTIONED IN Q's 17B, 18 OR 19, SKIP TO INSTRUCTION BEFORE Q. 21.

20. Were these new skills you learned, ones that you had expected to learn or not?

Expected to learn	1	53/R
Not expected to learn	2	
Some expected and some not	3	

ASK Q. 21 OF DROPOUTS ONLY (FACE SHEET ITEM L). IF RESPONDENT COMPLETED TRAINING, SKIP TO Q. 22

21. DROPOUTS ONLY

Why did you leave the training? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES--RECORD VERBATIM, THEN CIRCLE CODES THAT APPLY. (PROBE: Why was that? In what way? Any other reasons?)

Didn't like the instructors, instructors inadequate	y	54/R
Didn't like the training, training inadequate (other than instructors) . .	X	
Took a job for financial reasons	0	
Took a job, financial reasons not specified	1	
Needed the money, training allowance (pay) inadequate	2	
Family problems (including illness of family member)	3	
Own illness	4	
Pregnancy	5	
Transportation problems	6	
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________ ______________________________________	7	

---

22. Before training, how much confidence did you have in your ability to learn a new job and to hold it--a lot of confidence, some confidence, a little confidence, or no confidence at all?

A lot of confidence	1	55/R
Some confidence	2	
A little confidence	3	
No confidence at all	4	

---

23. How much confidence do you now have in your ability to learn a new job and to hold it--a lot of confidence, some confidence, a little confidence, or no confidence at all?

A lot of confidence	1	56/R
Some confidence	2	
A little confidence	3	
No confidence at all	4	

24. When you (finished/dropped out) of the training, how well qualified did you feel to begin the kind of job for which you had taken training--very well qualified, well qualified, somewhat qualified, or not qualified at all?

Very well qualified	1	57/R
Well qualified	2	
Somewhat qualified	3	
Not qualified at all	4	

---

25. If you had it to do over again now, would you go into the same MDTA training course, go into a different MDTA training course, or not go into any MDTA training course at all?

Same course	(GO TO Q. 26)	1	58/R
Different course	(ASK A AND B)	2	
No course	(ASK C)	3	

IF DIFFERENT COURSE:

A. What kind of job training course would you probably take?

B. Why would you take that instead?

IF NO COURSE:

C. Why would you not go into any MDTA training course?

---

26. Have you taken any other job training course since you left the course we've been talking about?

Yes	(ASK A)	1	66/R
No	(ASK B)	2	

A. IF YES: What job did that course train you for?

B. IF NO: Are you planning to take some other kind of job training?

Yes	(ASK (1))	1	70/R
No		2	

(1) What?

ASK EVERYONE:

27. Now let's see. The MDTA training course started on (date, Face Sheet Item E). ENTER

ASK COLUMNS A-H FOR ACTIVITY RESPONDENT HAD BEFORE DATE TRAINING STARTED. RECORD INF
COLUMN H.

THEN, BEGIN ON LINE 3, AND ASK COLUMNS A-H FOR ALL PREVIOUS ACTIVITIES RESPONDENT HAD
SEPTEMBER, 1961, OR RESPONDENT LEFT SCHOOL WHICHEVER COMES FIRST.

Line No.	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
(7-8)	ASK: (9-55) What were you doing before that? IF UNEMPLOYED, WRITE "UNEMPL." AND SKIP TO H.	ASK: (60) Was that in a private business, a gov't agency, or some other kind of organization?	ASK: (61-63) What was the weekly pay before taxes or other deductions, at the time you left?	ASK: (64-66 When did you start that job?
	JOB TITLE, DUTIES, OR ACTIVITY	PVT. GOV'T OTHER	DOLLAR AMOUNT	MONTH YEAR
1.	MDTA Training			
2.		1 2 3		
3.		1 2 3		
4.		1 2 3		
5.		1 2 3		
6.		1 2 3		
7.		1 2 3		
8.		1 2 3		
9.		1 2 3		
10.		1 2 3		
11.		1 2 3		

BEGIN DECK 04

TE ON LINE 1, COLUMN D.

MATION ON LINE 2 BELOW. IF UNEMPLOYED, ENTER "UNEMPL." IN COLUMN A ON LINE 2 AND ASK ONLY

PRIOR TO ACTIVITY RECORDED ON LINE 2. CONTINUE ON LINES 4, 5, ETC. UNTIL YOU REACH

.

Column E		Column F		Column G	Column H
ASK: (67-69) When did you leave that job?		ASK: (70) Was that full-time or part-time work?		ASK: (72) (HAND CARD A) Which of these reasons best describes why you left that job? just tell me the number, please.	ASK: (73-74) Why were you out of full-time work at that time?
MONTH	YEAR	Full-time (ASK G)	Part-time (ASK H)	RECORD NUMBER FOR "REASON LEFT" OR CIRCLE X AND PROBE	RECORD REASON
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	

BEGIN DECK 05

ASK EVERYONE:

28. Just before (date training started FS Item E), were you drawing unemployment compensation?

Yes . . . (ASK A AND B)	1	10/9
No . . . . (GO TO Q. 29)	2	

A. How much unemployment compensation were you drawing per week?

$ ☐☐☐ 11-13 RRR

B. At that time, how many more weeks of unemployment compensation were you entitled to?

☐☐ weeks 14-15 RR

29. A. What was your total weekly family income from all sources (just before you entered training/about date, FS Item E)?

$ ☐☐☐ 18-20 RRR

ASK B ONLY FOR THOSE ENROLLED IN COURSE ON FACE SHEET (FS ITEM L).

B. What was your total weekly family income from all sources just before you left training?

$ ☐☐☐ 21-23 RRR

ASK Q. 30 ONLY FOR THOSE ENROLLED IN COURSE ON FACE SHEET (FS ITEM L). FOR OTHERS, SKIP TO Q. 34.

30. During your training, did you ever receive a training allowance or unemployment compensation?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	1	24/R
No . . . . (GO TO INSTRUCTION BEFORE Q. 31)	2	

A. How much money were you getting per week?

$ ☐☐☐ 25-27 RRR

ASK Q. 31, OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED TRAINING ONLY. FOR "DROPOUTS," SKIP TO Q. 34.

31. Now let's talk about what happened during the month after you completed your training. At that time, to how many employers were you referred by the public employment service? IF NONE, ENTER "0" IN BOX AND SKIP TO Q. 33.

ENTER NUMBER HERE ☐ 28/R

A. Let's start with the first job to which you were referred. Was it a private business, a government agency, or another kind of organization? RECORD IN COLUMN A.

B. Was the job to which you were referred related to the training you had taken or not? RECORD IN COLUMN B.

C. Were you hired on that job? RECORD IN COLUMN C.

D. (IF "NOT HIRED," HAND RESPONDENT CARD B.) Which one of the reasons on this card best tells why you were not hired? Just tell me the number, please. WRITE NUMBER IN COLUMN D OR CIRCLE X THEN PROBE: Were there any other reasons? RECORD UNDER "OTHER" IN COLUMN D.

NOW SAY, "Let's talk about the next job to which you were referred," AND REPEAT QUESTIONS A-D UNTIL ALL JOB REFERRALS--Q. 31--ARE ACCOUNTED FOR.

A.			B.		C.		D.	
Kind of Organization			Rel.	Not Rel.	Hired	Not Hired	Reason Not Hired	
Pvt.	Gov't.	Other					Write #	Other
1	2	29/R 3	5	30/R 6	1	31/R 2	32/R X	
1	2	35/R 3	5	36/R 6	1	37/R 2	38/R X	
1	2	41/R 3	5	42/R 6	1	43/R 2	44/R X	
1	2	47/R 3	5	48/R 6	1	49/R 2	50/R X	
1	2	53/R 3	5	54/R 6	1	55/R 2	56/R X	

IF RESPONDENT GOT A JOB DURING THE MONTH AFTER TRAINING WAS COMPLETED, ASK Q. 32. OTHERWISE, GO TO Q. 33.

32. How well would you say the MDTA training course prepared you for this job--very well, fairly well, or not well at all?

Very well	1	59/R
Fairly well	2	
Not well at all . (ASK A) .	3	

A. Why is that? RECORD VERBATIM (PROBE: Any other reasons?)

IF "NONE" TO Q. 31, ASK Q. 33, OTHERWISE, GO TO Q. 34.

33. Why didn't they refer you to any employers?

34. Now I'd like to talk about the time since (you left training/Date Training started,

right after (you left training/date, FS Item E)? RECORD IN COLUMN A, LINE 1 BELOW.
CONTINUE ON LINES 3, 4, 5, ETC. UNTIL YOU GET TO CURRENT ACTIVITY.

Line No.	Column A	Column B		Column C			Column D	Column E		Column	
(7-8)	ASK: (9-55) What did you do after that? IF UNEMPLOYED, WRITE "UNEMPL." AND SKIP TO K.	ASK: (59) (Was/Is) that job related to the MDTA training you had? OMIT IF R DID NOT ENROLL IN MDTA		ASK: (60) (Was/Is) that in a private business, a gov't agency, or some other kind of organization?			ASK: (61-63) What (was/is) your weekly pay before taxes or other deductions?	ASK: (64-66) When did you start work there?		ASK: (6 69 When di you lea there?	
	JOB TITLE, DUTIES, OR ACTIVITY	YES	NO	PVT.	GOV'T	OTHER	DOLLAR AMT.	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YE
1		1	2	1	2	3	$				
2		1	2	1	2	3					
3		1	2	1	2	3					
4		1	2	1	2	3					
5		1	2	1	2	3					
6		1	2	1	2	3					
7		1	2			2					
8		1	2	1	2	3					

BEGIN DECK 06

Item E), that is, since ______________________. First, what did you do
ENTER DATE LEFT TRAINING OR FS ITEM E

SK COLUMNS B-K AND RECORD ON LINE 1. THEN BEGIN ON LINE 2 AND ASK A-K FOR NEXT ACTIVITY.

Column G		Column H	Column I	Column J	Column K
ASK: (70) (Was/Is) that full-time or part-time work?		ASK: What (was/is) the name and address of your employer on that job?	ASK: (71) (HAND CARD C) Which of the ways on this card best tells how you got this job Just tell me the number.	ASK: (72) (HAND CARD A) Which of these best tells why you left that job? Just the number.	ASK: (73-74) Why were you out of full-time work then?
Full-time (ASK H-J)	Part-time (SKIP TO K)	RECORD NAME AND ADDRESS	HOW OBTAINED ENTER CODE # OR CIRCLE X AND PROBE	WHY LEFT ENTER CODE # OR CIRCLE X AND PROBE	RECORD REASON
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	
1	2		X	X	

BEGIN DECK 08

ASK Q's 35-41 ONLY IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT HAVE A FULL-TIME JOB NOW. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q. 42.

35. Since you've been out of full-time work, what has been your one main means of support? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. CIRCLE ONE CODE.

Savings	y	10/R
Borrowing	x	
Spouse	0	
Parents	1	
Son or daughter	2	
Other relative or friend	3	
Unemployment compensation	4	
Part-time or odd jobs	5	
Veterans allowance	6	
Public assistance or welfare	7	
Other (SPECIFY) ________________	8	

---

36. Since (you left the training/date, FS Item E), have you been available for a full-time job all of the time, most of the time, part of the time, or not at all?

All of the time	1	11/R
Most of the time	2	
Part of the time	3	
Not at all . . (ASK A, THEN SKIP TO Q. 41)	4	

A. Why haven't you been available?

---

37. A. Why do you think you haven't been able to find a job? (PROBE: Any other reasons?) DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD VERBATIM. THEN CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY IN COLUMN A BELOW.
IF ONLY ONE REASON GIVEN IN "A," CIRCLE THAT CODE IN COLUMN B.

	A. Reason	B. Most Important Reason
Employers want more experience than I have	0	0
Not a union member	1	1
No jobs available for which I qualify	2	2
Jobs refused by me because of low wages	3	3
Jobs not available because of my age	4	4
Slack period in industry or jobs where I qualify	5	5
Employer's prejudice or discrimination	6	6
Other (SPECIFY) ________________	7	7
	12/R	13/R

B. Of the ones you've mentioned, which do you think is the most important reason that you haven't been able to find a job? CIRCLE ONE CODE IN COLUMN B ABOVE.

38. What have you done to try to get a job? (PROBE: Anything else?) DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD VERBATIM. THEN CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Registered at public employment office	y	14/R
Registered at private employment office(s)	X	
Applied to employers in this area	0	
Applied to employers outside this area	1	
Applied to union	2	
Answered newspaper ads	3	
Asked friends and/or relatives	4	
Nothing	5	
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________________	6	

---

39. Have you checked with the local employment office? IF YES: How often have you checked?

Yes, once a week or more often	1	15/R
Yes, once a month	2	
Yes, less often than once a month . . . . . . (ASK A)	3	
No, never . . . . . (ASK A)	4	

A. IF LESS OFTEN THAN ONCE A MONTH OR NEVER:

Why haven't you kept in touch (more often)? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES.

Personal illness	1	16/R
Illness in family	2	
Taking another course	3	
They have no jobs for me	4	
Not interested in full-time job	5	
Other (SPECIFY) __________________	6	

40. Please tell me if each of these statements concerning taking a job in another city applies to you or not. CIRCLE YES OR NO CODE ON EACH LINE.

Would you be willing to take a job in another city . . .	Yes	No	Don't Know	
A. If you could get a job in the line of work for which you were trained?	1	2	7	17/R
B. If you could get a job in the line of work you followed before retraining?	3	4	7	18/R
C. If your moving and re-location expenses were paid?	5	6	7	19/R
D. If the job was within this state?	1	2	7	20/R
E. If the wage rate was lower than what you have been use to?	3	4	7	21/R
F. If the wage rate was as high as you have been use to?	5	6	7	22/R
G. If the wage rate was higher than what you have been use to?	1	2	7	23/R
H. If the job was within 300 miles of here?	3	4	7	24/R
I. If you had to take up a completely new line of work?	5	6	7	25/R

41. All in all, do you think your chances of getting a job now are very good, good, fair, or poor?

Very good	1	26/R
Good	2	
Fair	3	
Poor	4	
Don't know	5	

42. ASK Q. 42 ONLY FOR THOSE WHO COMPLETED OR DROPPED OUT (FS ITEM L). FOR OTHERS, GO TO Q. 44.

Did the MDTA training you received . . .

	Yes	No	
A. Help you obtain employment?	1	2	27/R
B. Help you hold a job (you already had)?	3	4	28/R
C. Help you obtain a promotion?	5	6	29/R
D. Increase your weekly earnings?	1	2	30/R
E. Help you in any other way?	3	4	31/R

FOR EACH "YES" TO Q. 43 ASK: How did it help? RECORD VERBATIM ON APPROPRIATE LINE BELOW.

A. ____

B. ____

C. ____

D. ____

E. ____

FOR EACH "NO" TO Q. 43 ASK: Why didn't the MDTA training (help you obtain employment, help you hold a job, increase your weekly earnings)?

A. ____

B. ____

C. ____

D. ____

E. ____

ASK EVERYONE Q's 43 AND 44, UNLESS NEVER HAD A JOB.

43. How well would you say the MDTA training course prepared you for the (job you now have/last job you had)--very well, fairly well, or not well at all?

Very well	1	52/R
Fairly well	2	
Not well at all . . (ASK A) .	3	

A. Why is that? RECORD VERBATIM. (PROBE: Any other reasons?)

44. How well (do/did) you like your (present/last) job--very well, fairly well, not so well, or not well at all?

Very well	(GO TO Q. 45)	1	55/R
Fairly well	(GO TO Q. 45)	2	
Not so well	(ASK A)	3	
Not well at all	(ASK A)	4	

A. IF NOT WELL: What job, or kind of job, would you like to have?

ASK EVERYONE:

45. What was the highest grade of regular school you completed?

No formal schooling	(ASK A AND B)	0	59/9
1 - 4 years	(ASK A AND B)	1	
5 - 7 years	(ASK A AND B)	2	
8 years	(ASK A AND B)	3	
Some high school (1-3 years)	(ASK A AND B)	4	
Completed high school	(GO TO Q. 46)	5	
Some college	(GO TO Q. 46)	6	
Completed college	(GO TO Q. 46)	7	

A. IF COMPLETED ELEVEN YEARS OR LESS: What was the one most important reason for your leaving school? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. CODE UNDER A BELOW.

B. Any other reasons? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. CODE UNDER B BELOW.

	60/R A. Most Important	61/R B. Other Reasons
Own illness	y	y
Illness in family	X	X
Had to support self	0	0
Had to support family	1	1
Preferred work to school	2	2
Expelled	3	3
Military service	4	4
Trouble with teachers or school authorities	5	5
Married	6	6
Pregnant	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ________________	8	8
No other reason	—	9

---

46. Are you married, divorced, widowed, separated, or never married?

Married	1	62/9
Divorced	2	
Widowed	3	
Separated	4	
Never married	5	

47. Would you say your health is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent 1 63/0
Good 2
Fair 3
Poor 4

---

48. Have you any ailments or physical handicaps that limit your abilities to handle a full-time job?

Yes . . . . (ASK A) 5 64/9
No . . . . (GO TO Q. 49) . . 6

A. What is the nature of your physical handicap?

---

49. What is the total weekly income from all sources for your family?

Record amount $ ☐☐☐ 67-69 RRR

---

50. A. I need to know a little about the people in your household. Think back to (date training started/FS Item E) and tell me all the people who were living in your household at that time? I don't need to know their names--just how each one is related to you. Let's take them in order of age. LIST IN COLUMN A BELOW BEGINNING ON LINE 2. (PROBE: Have we forgotten anyone--a roomer, a boarder, or a baby in the family?)

B. How old (were you)(was person) at that time? RECORD IN COLUMN B. FOR EACH PERSON LISTED IN A.

C. (Were you) (Was he/she) married (M), widowed (W), divorced (D), separated (Sep.), or never married (NM) then? CODE IN COLUMN C.

D. Who was the main earner (Who actually earned the most money?) of the household at that time? CHECK IN COLUMN D. ON LINE OF PERSON WHO IS NAMED AS MAIN EARNER.

E. And who was the head of the household at that time? CHECK IN COLUMN E. ON LINE OF PERSON WHO IS NAMED AS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.

70-71
RR

A. Relationship to Respondent	B. Age	C. Marital Status					D. Check Main Earner	E. Check Household Head
		M	W	D	Sep.	NM		
1. RESPONDENT		1	2	3	4	5		
2.		1	2	3	4	5		
3.		1	2	3	4	5		
4.		1	2	3	4	5		
5.		1	2	3	4	5		
6.		1	2	3	4	5		
7.		1	2	3	4	5		
8.		1	2	3	4	5		
9.		1	2	3	4	5		
10.		1	2	3	4	5		
11.		1	2	3	4	5		
12.		1	2	3	4	5		

ASK Q. 51 ONLY IF RESPONDENT ACTUALLY ENROLLED IN MDTA TRAINING PROGRAM. (FACE SHEET, ITEM L.) OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q. 52.

51. A. ASK IF "YES" TO Q. 4 (PAGE 3)

Earlier in the interview you told me that you knew someone who was unemployed around the time you started training. Was that person looking for work then?

Yes . . . (ASK D AND E) 1
No . . . . (ASK E) 2

B. ASK IF "NO" TO Q. 4 (PAGE 3)

Do you know of any unemployed person who might have been interested in the MDTA training program around the time you began training?

Yes . . . (ASK C) 1
No . . . . (GO TO Q. 52) 2

C. Was that person looking for work then?

Yes . . . (ASK D AND E) 1
No . . . . (ASK E) 2

D. We'd like to talk to some people who did not take the training. Would you please give me this person's name and address? RECORD PERSON'S NAME AND ADDRESS IN THE SPACES PROVIDED ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. REASSURE RESPONDENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY IF HE/SHE IS RELUCTANT TO GIVE NAME.

E. Is there anyone else you know who was unemployed and looking for work around the time you started training? Please give me their name(s) and address(es).

Yes 1
No 2

PERSONS NAMED BY RESPONDENT

1. NAME: ______________________ ______________________ TELEPHONE NUMBER ________
(First) (Last)

STREET ADDRESS: ____
(FOR RURAL AREAS FIND OUT HOW TO LOCATE PERSON)

CITY, STATE: ____

2. NAME: ______________________ ______________________ TELEPHONE NUMBER ________
(First) (Last)

STREET ADDRESS: ____
(FOR RURAL AREAS FIND OUT HOW TO LOCATE PERSON)

CITY, STATE: ____

3. NAME: ______________________ ______________________ TELEPHONE NUMBER ________
(First) (Last)

STREET ADDRESS: ____
(FOR RURAL AREAS FIND OUT HOW TO LOCATE PERSON)

CITY, STATE: ____

52. Do you have a telephone number where you could be reached in case my office needs to check with you about anything?

Telephone Number: ____________________

That's all the questions I have. Thank you very much for your help.

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: ______________ AM / PM

FILL OUT ITEMS BELOW IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEAVING RESPONDENT

A. RESPONDENT'S SEX:

Male	1	72/9
Female	2	

B. RESPONDENT'S RACE:

White	1	73/9
Negro	2	
Other (SPECIFY) __________________	3	

C. DATE OF INTERVIEW: ____

D. INTERVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: ____

Survey N504
Bureau of the
Budget Number:
44-6552
Expires 6/30/66

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

TIME BEGAN: ________ AM PM

CASE NUMBER: C

CONTROL GROUP

Hello. I'm (your name) of the National Opinion Research Center.

We're making a survey for the Department of Labor and the Office of Education on why some people take part in government-sponsored job training programs and others don't. We're talking to people who were eligible for job training.

BEGIN DECK 02

SCREENING QUESTION

A. Before I go on, were you employed full time during the month of (date training started for Main Sample Respondent--Control Group Face Sheet Item D), 196___?

Yes	(GO TO B)	1	10/9
No	(ASK (1))	2	
Can't remember . .	(ASK D)	3	

(1) Were you looking for work at that time?

Yes	(CONTINUE WITH Q. 1).	1	11/R
No	(GO TO B)	2	
Can't remember . .	(ASK D)	3	

B. How about the three-month period before (date training started for Main Sample Respondent--Control Group Face Sheet Item D), 196___? Were you unemployed at any time during that period?

Yes	(ASK (1))	1	12/R
No	(GO TO C)	2	
Can't remember . .	(ASK D)	3	

(1) Were you looking for work at that time?

Yes	(CONTINUE WITH Q. 1).	1	13/R
No	(GO TO C)	2	
Can't remember . .	(ASK D)	3	

C. How about the three-month period after (date training started for Main Sample Respondent--Control Group Face Sheet Item D), 196___? Were you unemployed at any time during that period?

Yes	(ASK (1))	1	14/R
No	(TERMINATE INTERVIEW)	2	
Can't remember . .	(ASK D)	3	

(1) Were you looking for work at that time?

Yes	(CONTINUE WITH Q. 1).	1	15/R
No	(TERMINATE INTERVIEW)	2	
Can't remember . .	(ASK D)	3	

D. Do you remember what you were doing about then? RECORD VERBATIM. PROBE TO FIND OUT IF R WAS EVER UNEMPLOYED DURING SIX-MONTH PERIOD AROUND "DATE."

IF ANSWER TO D INDICATES FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT THROUGHOUT SIX-MONTH PERIOD, TERMINATE INTERVIEW.

IF EMPLOYED PART-TIME OR WORKING ON ODD JOBS (IN ANSWER TO D), CONTINUE WITH Q. 1.

1. Did you know that an MDTA training program to assist unemployed persons was being conducted in your town at that time and that you were probably eligible to attend?

Yes . . . . . (ASK A) 3   16/9
No . . . . . . (ASK C) 4

A. IF YES: Were you interested in taking training of this kind at that time?

Yes . . . . . (ASK B) 1   17/R
No . . . . . . (ASK E) 2

B. IF YES TO A: Why didn't you take the training? (PROBE: Any other reason?)

C. IF NO: Would you have been interested in taking job training at that time?

Yes 1   20/R
No . . . . . . (ASK E) 2
Depends . . . (ASK D) 3

D. IF DEPENDS TO C: On what would it depend?

E. IF NO TO A OR C: Why (weren't you/wouldn't you have been) interested?

2. Are you interested in taking training to learn a skill or trade?

Yes	(ASK A)	3	25/R
No	(ASK B)	4	

A. IF YES: What type of job would you like to train for?

B. IF NO: Why not?

---

3. Since (date, Control Group FS Item D) have you taken some kind of job training course?

Yes	(ASK A)	1	39/R
No	(SKIP TO Q. 9) . .	2	

A. How many courses did you take?

ENTER NUMBER HERE ☐ 40/R

IF RESPONDENT TOOK ONE OR TWO COURSES, ASK Q's 4-8 ABOUT ONE OR BOTH COURSES. IF RESPONDENT TOOK MORE THAN TWO COURSES, SAY: "Let's just talk about the first two training courses you took."

4. What job(s) did this training prepare you for? RECORD VERBATIM FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

FIRST COURSE	SECOND COURSE

5. As far as you know, who sponsored this training program--MDTA, ARA, Vocational Education, your state government, local school board, or who? CIRCLE ONE CODE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE		SECOND COURSE	
MDTA	1	47/R	1	48/R
ARA	2		2	
Vocational Education	3		3	
State government	4		4	
Local school board	5		5	
Other (SPECIFY)	6		6	

6. When did that training program start? RECORD DATE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE			SECOND COURSE	
	Month | Year	51/R		Month | Year	54/R
49-50 RR	| '6		52-53 RR	| '6	

7. Did you complete that training program or leave it before it ended? CIRCLE ONE CODE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE		SECOND COURSE	
Completed course	1	55/R	1	56/R
Left course	2		2	
Course still in progress . .	3		3	

8. When did you (complete/leave) this program? RECORD DATE FOR EACH TRAINING COURSE.

	FIRST COURSE			SECOND COURSE	
	Month | Year	59/R		Month | Year	62/R
57-58 RR	| '6		60-61 RR	| '6	

ASK EVERYONE

9. A. Here are some reasons people have given for wanting to enter a training program. Please tell me for each one whether that was a reason that applied to you? READ EACH ITEM BELOW AND CIRCLE YES OR NO CODE FOR EACH.

	A.		
	Yes	No	
To get a job in a different line of work	1	0	63/X
To learn new work skills	2	0	64/X
To get a job that paid more money	3	0	65/X
To get a more interesting job	4	0	66/X
To get a job that was steady, regular employment	5	0	67/X
To get an easier job	6	0	68/X
To improve my skills or knowledge for a job I already had	7	0	69/X
Just to get a job, no matter what it was	8	0	70/X
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	9	0	71/X

B. IF ONLY ONE REASON GIVEN IN "A," ENTER THAT CODE IN THE BOX BELOW WITHOUT ASKING. You told me that (READ ITEMS CODED "YES" IN COLUMN A) were reasons for your wanting to enter the training program. Which of these would you say was the most important reason for your wanting to enter the training program? ENTER CODE NUMBER IN BOX.

☐ 72/X

GO ON TO PAGE 8.

10. [We are interested in your employment before (date, Control Group Face Sheet Item D).

ASK COLUMNS A-H FOR ACTIVITY RESPONDENT HAD BEFORE DATE TRAINING STARTED FOR MAIN SA
COLUMN A ON LINE 2 AND ASK ONLY COLUMN H.

THEN, BEGIN ON LINE 3, AND ASK COLUMNS A-H FOR ALL PREVIOUS ACTIVITIES RESPONDENT HAD
SEPTEMBER, 1961, OR RESPONDENT LEFT SCHOOL WHICHEVER COMES FIRST.

Line No.	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D
(7-8)	ASK: (9-55) What were you doing before that? IF UNEMPLOYED, WRITE "UNEMPL." AND SKIP TO H.	ASK: (60) Was that in a private business, a gov't agency, or some other kind of organization?	ASK: (61-63) What was the weekly pay before taxes or other deductions, at the time you left?	ASK: (64-65) When did you start that job?
	JOB TITLE, DUTIES, OR ACTIVITY	PVT. GOV'T OTHER	DOLLAR AMOUNT	MONTH YEAR
1.	M.S. R's MDTA Training			
2.		1 2 3		
3.		1 2 3		
4.		1 2 3		
5.		1 2 3		
6.		1 2 3		
7.		1 2 3		
8.		1 2 3		
9.		1 2 3		
10.		1 2 3		
11.		1 2 3		

BEGIN DECK 04

NTER DATE ON LINE 1, COLUMN D.

E RESPONDENT. RECORD INFORMATION ON LINE 2 BELOW. IF UNEMPLOYED, ENTER "UNEMPL." IN

RIOR TO ACTIVITY RECORDED ON LINE 2. CONTINUE ON LINES 4, 5, ETC. UNTIL YOU REACH

Column E		Column F		Column G	Column H
SK: (67-69) When did you leave that job?		ASK: (70) Was that full-time or part-time work?		ASK: (72) (HAND CARD A) Which of these reasons best describes why you left that job? ust tell me the number, please.	ASK: (73-74) Why were you out of full-time work at that time?
MONTH	YEAR	Full-time (ASK G)	Part-time (ASK H)	RECORD NUMBER FOR "REASON LEFT" OR CIRCLE X AND PROBE	RECORD REASON
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	
		1	2	X	

BEGIN DECK 05

ASK EVERYONE:

11. Just before date (date, Control Group Face Sheet Item D), were you drawing unemployment compensation?

Yes . . . (ASK A AND B)	1	10/9
No . . . . (GO TO Q.12)	2	

A. How much unemployment compensation were you drawing per week?

$ ☐☐☐ 11-13 / RRR

B. At that time, how many more weeks of unemployment compensation were you entitled to?

☐☐ weeks 14-15 / RR

---

12. What was your total weekly family income from all sources about (date, Control Group Face Sheet Item D)?

$ ☐☐☐ 18-20 / RRR

13. Now I'd like to talk about the time since (date, Control Group Face Sheet Item D). F

RECORD IN COLUMN A, LINE 1 BELOW. ASK COLUMNS C-K AND RECORD ON LINE 1. THEN BEGIN
CURRENT ACTIVITY.

Line No.	Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E		Column F	
(7-8)	ASK: (9-55) What did you do after that? IF UNEMPLOYED, WRITE "UNEMPL." AND SKIP TO K.		ASK: (60) (Was/Is) that in a private business, a gov't agency, or some other kind of organization?	ASK: (61-63) What (was/is) your weekly pay before taxes or other deductions?	ASK: (64-66) When did you start work there?		ASK: (67 69) When di you lea there?	
	JOB TITLE, DUTIES, OR ACTIVITY		PVT. GOV'T OTHER	DOLLAR AMT.	MONTH	YEAR	MONTH	YE
1.			1 2 3	$				
2.			1 2 3					
3.			1 2 3					
4.			1 2 3					
5.			1 2 3					
6.			1 2 3					
7.			1 2 2					
8.			1 2 3					

BEGIN DECK 06

hat were you doing then?

NE 2 AND ASK A-K FOR NEXT ACTIVITY. CONTINUE ON LINES 3, 4, 5, ETC. UNTIL YOU GET TO

mn G	Column H	Column I	Column J	Column K
(70) /Is) l- e or t- e k?	ASK: What (was/is) the name and address of your employer on that job?	ASK: (71) (HAND CARD C) Which of the ways on this card best tells how you got this job Just tell me the number.	ASK: (72) (HAND CARD A) Which of these best tells why you left that job? Just the number.	ASK: (73-74) Why were you out of full-time work then?
l- Part- e time K (SKIP) TO K)	RECORD NAME AND ADDRESS	HOW OBTAINED ENTER CODE # OR CIRCLE X AND PROBE	WHY LEFT ENTER CODE # OR CIRCLE X AND PROBE	RECORD REASON
2		X	X	
2		X	X	
2		X	X	
2		X	X	
2		X	X	
2		X	X	
2		X	X	
2		X	X	

BEGIN DECK 08

ASK Q's 14-20 ONLY IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT HAVE A FULL-TIME JOB NOW. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO Q. 21.

14. Since you've been out of full-time work, what has been your one main means of support? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. CIRCLE ONE CODE.

Savings	y	10/R
Borrowing	X	
Spouse	0	
Parents	1	
Son or daughter	2	
Other relative or friend	3	
Unemployment compensation	4	
Part-time or odd jobs	5	
Veterans allowance	6	
Public assistance or welfare . . .	7	
Other (SPECIFY) ______________	8	

---

15. Since (date, Control Group Face Sheet Item D), have you been available for a full-time job all of the time, most of the time, part of the time, or not at all?

All of the time	1	11/R
Most of the time	2	
Part of the time	3	
Not at all . . (ASK A, THEN SKIP TO Q. 20)	4	

A. Why haven't you been available?

---

16. A. Why do you think you haven't been able to find a job? (PROBE: Any other reasons?) DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD VERBATIM. THEN CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY IN COLUMN A BELOW.
IF ONLY ONE REASON GIVEN IN "A," CIRCLE THAT CODE IN COLUMN B.

	A. Reason	B. Most Important Reason
Employers want more experience than I have	0	0
Not a union member	1	1
No jobs available for which I qualify	2	2
Jobs refused by me because of low wages	3	3
Jobs not available because of my age	4	4
Slack period in industry or jobs where I qualify	5	5
Employer's prejudice or discrimination	6	6
Other (SPECIFY) ______________	7	7
	12/R	13/R

B. Of the ones you've mentioned, which do you think is the most important reason that you haven't been able to find a job? CIRCLE ONE CODE IN COLUMN B ABOVE.

17. What have you done to try to get a job? (PROBE: Anything else?) DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. RECORD VERBATIM. THEN CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.

Registered at public employment office	y	14/R
Registered at private employment office(s)	X	
Applied to employers in this area	0	
Applied to employers outside this area	1	
Applied to union	2	
Answered newspaper ads	3	
Asked friends and/or relatives	4	
Nothing	5	
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	6	

---

18. Have you checked with the local employment office? IF YES: How often have you checked?

Yes, once a week or more often	1	15/R
Yes, once a month	2	
Yes, less often than once a month (ASK A)	3	
No, never (ASK A)	4	

A. IF LESS OFTEN THAN ONCE A MONTH OR NEVER:

Why haven't you kept in touch (more often)? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES.

Personal illness	1	16/R
Illness in family	2	
Taking another course	3	
They have no jobs for me	4	
Not interested in full-time job	5	
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	6	

19. Please tell me if each of these statements concerning taking a job in another city applies to you or not. CIRCLE YES OR NO CODE ON EACH LINE.

Would you be willing to take a job in another city . . .	Yes	No	Don't Know	
A. If you could get a job in the line of work for which you were trained?	1	2	7	17/R
B. If you could get a job in the line of work you followed before retraining?	3	4	7	18/R
C. If your moving and re-location expenses were paid?	5	6	7	19/R
D. If the job was within this state?	1	2	7	20/R
E. If the wage rate was lower than what you have been used to?	3	4	7	21/R
F. If the wage rate was as high as you have been use to?	5	6	7	22/R
G. If the wage rate was higher than what you have been used to?	1	2	7	23/R
H. If the job was within 300 miles of here?	3	4	7	24/R
I. If you had to take up a completely new line of work?	5	6	7	25/R

---

20. All in all, do you think your chances of getting a job now are very good, good, fair, or poor?

Very good	1	26/R
Good	2	
Fair	3	
Poor	4	
Don't know	5	

21. How well (do/did) you like your (present/last) job--very well, fairly well, not so well, or not well at all?

Very well . . (GO TO Q. 22) .	1	55/R
Fairly well . (GO TO Q. 22) .	2	
Not so well . (ASK A)	3	
Not well at all (ASK A) . . .	4	

A. IF NOT WELL: What job, or kind of job, would you like to have?

ASK EVERYONE:

22. What was the highest grade of regular school you completed?

No formal schooling	(ASK A AND B)	0	59/9
1 - 4 years	(ASK A AND B)	1	
5 - 7 years	(ASK A AND B)	2	
8 years	(ASK A AND B)	3	
Some high school (1-3 years)	(ASK A AND B)	4	
Completed high school . . .	(GO TO Q. 23)	5	
Some college	(GO TO Q. 23)	6	
Completed college	(GO TO Q. 23)	7	

A. IF COMPLETED ELEVEN YEARS OR LESS: What was the one most important reason for your leaving school? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. CODE UNDER A BELOW.

B. Any other reasons? DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. CODE UNDER B BELOW.

	60/R A. Most Important	61/R B. Other Reasons
Own illness	y	y
Illness in family	X	X
Had to support self	0	0
Had to support family	1	1
Preferred work to school . . .	2	2
Expelled	3	3
Military service	4	4
Trouble with teachers or school authorities	5	5
Married	6	6
Pregnant	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______	8	8
No other reason	—	9

---

23. Are you married, divorced, widowed, separated, or never married?

Married	1	62/9
Divorced	2	
Widowed	3	
Separated	4	
Never married	5	

24. Would you say your health is excellent, good, fair, or poor?

Excellent 1 63/9
Good 2
Fair 3
Poor 4

25. Have you any ailments or physical handicaps that limit your abilities to handle a full-time job?

Yes . . . . (ASK A) 5 64/9
No . . . . (GO TO Q. 26) . . 6

A. What is the nature of your physical handicap?

26. What is the total weekly income from all sources for your family?

Record amount $ ☐☐☐ 67-69 / RRR

27. A. I need to know a little about the people in your household. Think back to (date, Control Group Face Sheet Item D) and tell me all the people who were living in your household at that time? I don't need to know their names--just how each one is related to you. Let's take them in order of age. LIST IN COLUMN A BELOW BEGINNING ON LINE 2. (PROBE: Have we forgotten anyone--a roomer, a boarder, or a baby in the family?)

B. How old (were you)(was person) at that time? RECORD IN COLUMN B. FOR EACH PERSON LISTED IN A.

C. (Were you) (Was he/she) married (M), widowed (W), divorced (D), separated (Sep.), or never married (NM) then? CODE IN COLUMN C.

D. Who was the main earner (Who actually earned the most money?) of the household at that time? CHECK IN COLUMN D. ON LINE OF PERSON WHO IS NAMED AS MAIN EARNER.

E. And who was the head of the household at that time? CHECK IN COLUMN E. ON LINE OF PERSON WHO IS NAMED AS HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD.

70-71 / RR

A. Relationship to Respondent	B. Age	C. Marital Status					D. Check Main Earner	E. Check Household Head
		M	W	D	Sep.	NM		
1. RESPONDENT		1	2	3	4	5		
2.		1	2	3	4	5		
3.		1	2	3	4	5		
4.		1	2	3	4	5		
5.		1	2	3	4	5		
6.		1	2	3	4	5		
7.		1	2	3	4	5		
8.		1	2	3	4	5		
9.		1	2	3	4	5		
10.		1	2	3	4	5		
11.		1	2	3	4	5		
12.		1	2	3	4	5		

28. Do you have a telephone number where you could be reached in case my office needs to check with you about anything?

Telephone Number: ___________________

That's all the questions I have. Thank you very much for your help.

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: ______________ AM PM

FILL OUT ITEMS BELOW IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEAVING RESPONDENT

A. RESPONDENT'S SEX:

Male	1	72/9
Female	2	

B. RESPONDENT'S RACE:

White	1	73/9
Negro	2	
Other (SPECIFY) __________________	3	

C. SOURCE OF RESPONDENT:

Main Sample Respondent	1	74/9
Canvassing	2	

D. DATE OF INTERVIEW: ____

E. INTERVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: ____